HANDBOUND
AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF
TORONTO PRESS

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

https://archive.org/details/classicalreview11clasuoft

7504

THE

CLASSICAL REVIEW.

VOLUME XI.

43492
98

London:
DAVID NUTT, 270 AND 271 STRAND.
1897.

RICHARD CLAY AND SONS, LIMITED,
LONDON AND BUNGAY.

PA
1
C7
v.11

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

No. 1.

PAGE

R. M. Burrows. Pylos and Sphacteria 1
R. W. Macan. The Date of Tyrtaeus . 10
E. W. Fay. Contested Etymologies . 12
W. G. Rutherford. Conjectures in the Text of the *Comici Graeci* . . . 16
H. Richards. Critical Notes on the Minor Works of Xenophon (*Hiero, Hipparchicus, De Re Equest.*) [*Continued* from Vol. X., p. 294] 17
J. P. Postgate. On some Passages in Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* and *Hellenics* 21
M. L. Earle. Critical Notes on Cicero *De Oratore I.* 22
P. H. Damsté. Note on Curtius vi. 4, 7 26
W. W. Merry. Note on Juvenal x., 82 26
J. Stanley. Note on Lucret. v., 436 . 27
R. Y. Tyrrell and T. L. Agar. On a Question of Homeric Metrical Rule . 28
A. Souter. Greek Metrical Inscriptions from Phrygia. (*Continued* from Vol. X., p. 420) 31
F. Granger and W. Warde Fowler. On Burial Customs of Early Rome . 33

Reviews.

Francken's Edition of Lucan. W. E. Heitland 35
Treatises on Statius by Lafaye and by Klotz. Robinson Ellis . . . 43
Grenfell's Edition of The Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus. W. Wyse 47
Blaydes' *Adversaria in Aeschylum.* W. Headlam 56
Christ's Edition of Pindar. R. Y. Tyrrell 59
Hirtzel's *Der Dialog.* R. D. Hicks . 61
Von Arnim on the Date of Plato's Dialogues. L. Campbell 63
Shuckburgh's *Suetonii Augustus* and Smilda's *Suetonii Claudius.* F. T. Richards 63
Cohn's Edition of Philo, Vol. I. F. C. Conybeare 66
Egbert's Introduction to the Study of Latin Inscriptions. F. Haverfield 67
De Nino's *Archeologia Leggendaria.* R. S. Conway 69
A. Platt. Greek Elegiacs 70

Archaeology.

Collignon's *Histoire de la Sculpture grecque.* Percy Gardner 70
Thomas' *Rome et l'Empire.* Louis Dyer 72
C. Torr. *Memphis and Mycenae* (a Reply) 74
Monthly Record 82
Summaries of Periodicals 83
Bibliography 85

No. 2.

PAGE

E. W. Fay. Contested Etymologies . 89
A. Platt. Agamemnonea 94
F. Haverfield. Notes on Aesch. *Prom.* 358 98
E. C. Marchant. Notes on Thucydides, Book VI. 98
Robinson Ellis. On an epigram of Leonidas of Tarentum 100
T. L. Agar. Note on *Iliad* xx. 18 . . 101
A. E. Housman. Critical Notes on Ovid's *Heroides* 102
J. H. Gray. Note on Plaut. *Epid.* 19, 625 106
St. George Stock. On *Alcestis* 320–322 107
Andrew Lang. On the Magical Papyri 107
R. H. Gretton. On Cic. *ad Fam.* i. 2, 2 108
C. D. Chambers. On the construction of οὐ μή 109
G. E. Marindin. On the meaning of *ad* in *ad Opis* and similar expressions 111
Reviews.
Jebb's *Ajax*. A. S. 113

PAGE

Van Oordt on Plato and his Times. R. D. Hicks 116
Wessely's *Corpus Papyrorum Raineri*, Vol. I. H. 118
Horton-Smith's *Sophocles and Shakespeare*. Lewis Campbell 119
Hartman's *Epistola Critica*. T. L. Agar 120
Archaeology.
Hitzig-Blümner's Edition of Pausanias. E. Gardner 123
Bornecque's Edition of Cicero *De Signis*. E. Sellers 124
Schneider's *Das Alte Rom*. W. C. F. Anderson 126
Marriott on the Masons' Marks at Pompeii. W. C. F. Anderson . . 126
Boissier's *Afrique Romaine*. W. C. F. Anderson 127
Translation of Boissier's *Nouvelles Promenades*. W. C. F. Anderson. 127
J. Myres. Torr's *Memphis and Mycenae* 128
Summaries of Periodicals 130
Bibliography 131

No. 3.

H. Richards. Critical Notes on the Minor Works of Xenophon vi. and vii. (*The Constitutions*) 133
A. Souter. Greek Metrical Inscriptions from Phrygia. (*Continued*) . . 136
M. W. Humphreys. Notes on Greek Grammar 138
E. H. Miles. Notes on the Dative of the Possessor 142
E. W. Fay. Contested Etymologies . 143
K. Lake. Notes on *Didache* 1, 2, and *Acts* 15, 20, 29 147
E. B. Lease. On Instances of Diaeresis at every foot in Latin Metres . . . 148
C. M. Mulvany, R. C. Seaton, and A. Platt. On the Fourth Thesis of the Homeric Hexameter 151
G. B. Grundy. On Pylos and Sphacteria 155
M. L. Earle. Note on Plato, *Symp.* 179 C 159
H. A. Strong. Notes on Ter. *Ad.* 415 and Plaut. *Most.* 805 159
Reviews.
Brenous' *Hellénismes dans la Syntaxe latine*. F. D. Allen 160
Recent Editions of Hippocrates. T. C. Allbutt 162
Ludwich's Edition of the *Batrachomachia*. T. W. Allen 165
Postgate's Edition of Lucan, Book vii. S. G. Owen 167
Hauvette on the Epigrams of Simonides. H. Stuart Jones 170
Archaeology.
Babelon's *Les Origines de la Monnaie*. Percy Gardner 172
Monthly Record 173
Summaries of Periodicals 174
Bibliography 175

No. 4.

PAGE

W. M. Lindsay. Discovery of a Collation of the lost 'Codex Turnebi' of Plautus 177
C. M. Francken. On the Text of Francken's Edition of Lucan 180
A. W. Verrall. On the Date of Tyrtaeus 185
C. D. Buck. On the Genitives Τλᾱσῐᾶϝο and Πασιάδᾱϝο 190
R. C. Christie. The Earliest Appearance in Print of the First Idyll of Moschus 191
E. Poste. Notes on Jebb's Edition of Sophocles 192
H. W. Greene. Notes on the *Oedipus Tyrannus* 199
A. E. Housman. Critical Notes on Ovid's *Heroides* 200
Robinson Ellis. Emendations of Lucretius 204
John E. B. Mayor. Three New Fragments of Cicero 206

PAGE

W. E. Heitland. Note on Lucan viii. 7 206
Reviews.
Krumbacher's Byzantine Literature. J. B. Bury 207
Bruhn's Edition of the *Iphigenia in Tauris*. A. T. Murray 212
Greenidge's Greek Constitutional History. E. M. Walker 216
McCosh's Edition of the *Bacchides*. J. H. Gray 219
Zuretti's Editions of the Iliad and Odyssey. C. M. Mulvany 220
Archaeology.
Die Marcussäule. Percy Gardner . 221
Gardner's Handbook of Greek Sculpture. II. G. F. Hill 223
C. Torr. Torr's Memphis and Mycenae 224
Monthly Record 226
Summaries of Periodicals 227
Bibliography 228

No. 5.

H. Richards. Critical Notes on the Minor Works of Xenophon (*continued from p.* 136) 229
A. E. Housman. Critical Notes on Ovid's *Heroides* 238
M. L. Earle. Notes on *Il.* i. 418 and *Od.* xix. 234 242
C. M. Mulvany. Note on *Od.* iv. 544–7 243
J. S. Reid. Note on Cicero, *Ad. Fam.* 1, 2, 2, and 1, 1, 2 244
W. M. Lindsay. On the Discovery of a Collation of the 'Codex Turnebi' of Plautus: II. 246
B. W. Henderson. On the Grant of Immunitas to Brundisium 251
A. Platt. On Homeric Genitives . . 255
W. E. Heitland. On Francken's Edition of Lucan 257
R. M. Burrows. Aristides and the Battle of Salamis 258
John E. B. Mayor. *Horret* Impersonal 259
F. D. Allen. Note on Soph., *Trach.* 781, 782 259
E. C. Marchant. Note on Ausonius, *Id.* 13 260
H. A. Strong. Notes on Ausonius . . 260
W. M. Ramsay. A Question in Accentuation 261
Correction to the Note on p. 206 . . . 261
Reviews.
De Ridder's *L'Idée de la Mort en Grèce*. A. W. Verrall 262
Hunziker on Hyperbole in Virgil. E. B. Koster 266
Cartault on Virgil's Bucolics. F. Haverfield 269
Ridley's Translation of the *Pharsalia* of Lucan. J. P. P. 270
Molhuysen on MSS. of the Odyssey. C. M. Mulvany 273
Franklin's *Traces of Epic Influence in Aeschylus*. H. W. Hayley . . 275
Archaeology.
Head's Catalogue of Greek Coins in the British Museum. Percy Gardner 275
Monthly Record 276

No. 6.

PAGE

J. B. Bury. The European Expedition of Darius 277
C. C. J. Webb. Catulus of Parma . . 282
W. Lutoslawski. On Stylometry. (*Abstract of a Paper read at the Oxford Philological Society.*) 284
A. E. Housman. Critical Notes on Ovid's *Heroides*. (*Continued*) . . . 286
C. M. Mulvany. On *Od.* i. 253 *seq.* . 290
L. R. Farnell. On Aesch. *Agam.* 69–71. (*A Paper read at the Oxford Philological Society.*) 293
E. W. Fay. On the Etymology of the words *Cortina, Cortex* 298
C. A. M. Fennell. On the Etymology of *Ingens* 300
R. C. Seaton. On Aristotle's *Poetics* c. 25 300
T. G. Tucker. On Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1435 *sqq.* 302
E. I. Robson. Notes on Cicero *Pro Sestio* 303

PAGE

H. W. Hayley. Miscellanea 304
L. C. Purser. Note on Cicero *ad. Att.*, V. 19. 2 305
C. C. J. Webb. Fronto and Plutarch . 305
E. W. Watson. On Notae Tironianae attributed to St. Cyprian 306
C. D. Buck. On the genitive Πασιάδᾱϝο 307
J. Masson. On Marullus's Text of Lucretius 307
Reviews.
Postgate's *Silva Maniliana*. E. J. Webb 307
Hogarth's *Philip and Alexander of Macedon*. F. T. Richards. . . . 313
Blass's Edition of the Acts. T. E. Page 317
Archaeology.
De Ridder on Early Greek Bronze Reliefs 321
Summaries of Periodicals 322
Bibliography 323

No 7.

A. Gudeman. Notes on the *Agricola* of Tacitus 325
H. Richards. Notes on the Minor Works of Xenophon. VIII. (*The Agesilaus*) 332
E. A. Sonnenschein. *Sabellus:* Sabine or Samnite? 339
T. G. Tucker. On a Point of Metre in Greek Tragedy 341
E. W. Fay. On Oblique Questions in Retort: and on the Ironical use of *Ne* in Purpose-Clauses 344–346
J. Stanley. On *Sic* as a Secondary Predicate 346
E. B. Lease. Note on the use of *Numne* 348
C. M. Mulvany. On the Cyprian *ï* . . 349
J. Adam. Emendations of Plato, *Rep.* ix. 580 D and III. 390 A 349
J. S. Reid. Notes on some Passages in Cicero's Letters 350
J. C. Kirtland. Notes on the word *Orator*, and on Ter. *Ad.* 223–4 . . . 351
Reviews.
Buecheler and Riese's *Anthologia Latina*. J. S. Reid 353
Van Leeuwen's Edition of the *Ranae*. F. W. Hall 355
Kirtland's Edition of Horace. C. Knapp 358
Moulton and Geden's Concordance to the Greek Testament. J. B. Mayor 359
Von Arnim's Edition of Chrysostom. W. R. Paton 362
Lupus's Translation of Freeman's *Sicily*. F. Haverfield 362
Gevaert on the Second Delphic Hymn. H. Stuart Jones 364
Clerici's *I tre Poemi; Iliade, Odissea, Eneide*. M. H. 364
F. Pollock. Greek Iambics 365
Archaeology.
G. F. Hill. Ancient Coins from Pondoland 365
Monthly Record 367
Summaries of Periodicals 368
Bibliography 370

No. 8.

PAGE

F. W. Thomas. On the Accusative with Infinitive 373
Sp. Lambros. A new Codex of Paeanius 382
E. W. B. Nicholson. Fragment of an Earlier Edition of Apollonius's Homeric Lexicon 390
J. B. Bury. On the word ἀμφότεροι in Later Greek 393
T. W. Allen. Hesiodea 396
S. G. Owen. On Some Passages in Juvenal I. and III. 399
T. G. Tucker. Notes on the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus 403
J. P. Postgate. Propertiana 405

PAGE

Reviews.
Grenfell and Hunt's *Greek Papyri.* F. G. Kenyon 405
Lindsay's *Introduction to Latin Textual Emendation.* J. P. Postgate 408
Diels' *Parmenides.* L. Campbell . . 409
How and Leigh's *History of Rome.* L. C. Purser 409
Holmes' *Index Lysiacus.* J. E. Sandys 411
Wattenbach's *Schriftwesen im Mittelalter.* F. G. Kenyon 411
Obituary Notice of Professors Lane and Allen 412
Monthly Record 415
Summaries of Periodicals 416

No. 9.

Robinson Ellis and A. Platt. Notes on the Fragment of Menander's Γεωργός 417
H. Richards. The Minor Works of Xenophon IX. (The Πόροι) 418
A. E. Housman. Critical Notes on Ovid's *Heroides.* (*Continued*) . . . 425
W. Rhys Roberts. The Quotation from *Genesis* in the *De Sublimitate* . 431
A. H. J. Greenidge. The Porcian Coins and the Porcian Laws 437
C. C. J. Webb. On some Fragments of the *Saturnalia* of Macrobius 441
J. B. Mayor. Unrecorded Uses of αὐτίκα 442
E. A. Nairn. The Division of Horace *Od.* i. 28 into Two Separate Odes . . 444
T. L. Agar. On the word διήφυσε in Homer 445
F. Haverfield. Note on Tacitus, *Agric.* 24 447
G. B. Grundy. Note on the Topography of Pylos 448
J. B. Bury. Note on Aesch. *Agam.* 735 448
J. E. B. Mayor. The Sun's Rays shining undefiled on Filth 449
Reviews.
Kenyon's *Editio Princeps* of Bacchylides. J. A. Nairn 449
Nicole's Fragments of Menander. F. G. Kenyon 453
Heinze's Edition of Lucretius. Book III. W. A. Merrill 455
Kaibel's Edition of the *Antigone.* L. Campbell 456
Klebs and Dessau's *Prosopographia Imperii Romani.* F. T. Richards 457
Caruselli on the Origin of the Italians. R. S. Conway 458
Archaeology.
Jex-Blake and Sellers' *The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art.* A. G. Bather 458
Monthly Record 460
Summaries of Periodicals 461
Bibliography 462

The Classical Review

FEBRUARY 1897.

PYLOS AND SPHACTERIA.

A Reply to Mr. Grundy.

Pylos and Sphacteria have been once again the victims of coincidence. For many years they received from scholars about as much attention as if they had been once, casually, mentioned by Pausanias. Suddenly, within succeeding fortnights, there were paid to them two lengthy and altogether independent visits of inquiry. It seemed natural, as Mr. Grundy has explained, that the publication of the results of these two visits should also, in the first instance, be simultaneous. The work of mutual criticism might be left to come later. Our first articles therefore appeared, side by side, in the April number of the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, published in September, and Mr. Grundy has now opened the discussion in the *Classical Review* for November with a courteous criticism of my position. He has explained clearly the many important points on which from the first we were agreed. If I seem in my answer to be overpolemical, it is only due to the fact that there is no object in again going over these points of agreement. I have only to state clearly from my point of view where we differ, and why.

The questions now or originally in dispute, group themselves best, I think, under five heads :[1]—

I. The details of the last struggle on Sphacteria.

II. The line of Athenian defence on the South, South East, and South West of Pylos.

III. The line of Athenian defence on the North of Pylos.

IV. The origin and nature of Thucydides' mistake as to the harbour and its channels,

V. The origin of the incorrect length assigned in our texts to Sphacteria.

I. In regard to the last struggle on the Sphacteria, I am glad to see that Mr. Grundy has considerably altered his position. He originally placed the Spartans in a semi-circle on the west of Mount Elias, and imagined that the Messenians passed round into the hollow 'either from the north or south,' and then climbed the summit of Mount Elias from the east.[2] He apparently did not realise that it is inconceivable, quite apart from any question of the *παλαιὸν ἔρυμα*, that the Athenians should have let the greater part of the day go by,[3] without moving round towards the north of the hollow; and inconceivable, that the Spartans should not have been on the look out for such a

[1] I am sorry not to be able in any way to keep to the heads of Mr. Grundy's paper in the *C.R.* But by inadvertence he has made a misarrangement. His 4D, 4E, &c., ought to be 5, 6, &c., as they are not sections of the fortifications of Pylos. It is not worth while perpetuating this.

[2] *J.H.S.*, p. 41.

[3] Thuc. IV., 35, 4, *τὸ πλεῖστον τῆς ἡμέρας*. Mr. Grundy, *J.H.S.*, pp. 39, 40, does not bring this fact out clearly.

manœuvre. The hollow must then have been reached from the south or south-east, whether my identification of the ground plan of the παλαιὸν ἔρυμα holds good or not. Mr. Grundy has now provisionally accepted that identification. But I am anxious to insist on the fact that whether or no the archaeologists, whom the British School hope to send down to Pylos this winter, report in favour of all of my walls, the passage of the Messenians into the hollow cannot have been from the north. Indeed I may repeat[1] that the numbers of the Spartans still surviving, and the nature of the summit of Mount Elias, render it almost certain, apart from other considerations, that the north side of the hollow was from the first occupied by the defending force. About the walls themselves I have nothing new to say. I need only remark that Mr. Grundy undoubtedly did not see them. He could not have mistaken them, except in one or two of the worst preserved parts, for the stratification of the limestone rock. The fact is, that, on his own showing,[2] he omitted to ascend Mount Elias on the one side where the remains are so extensive that they could not have failed to arrest his attention. He ascended it from the north, south, and east, but not from the west. It is curious that Mr. Grundy himself, in my opinion, mistakes rock formation for stone building in the case of the Nestorian remains which he claims to have found on Hagio Nikolo.[3] I happened myself to have examined his stone circle in Hagio Nikolo, and decided that it was natural, and not artificial, before I set foot on Sphacteria.

To return, however, to the stratagem of the Messenians. Mr. Grundy does not see that once he accepts my general conception of the attack and defence, there is little need for us to quarrel as to the exact route which the Messenians took to get to the one and only side by which they could have entered the hollow. Mr. Grundy thinks that there may have been some ledge a little below the top of the cliff along which they could have climbed to the south of the hollow.[4] If such a ledge existed and were passable, I should prefer it to my gully. For it is certainly preferable to be able to dispense with my theory of re-embarkation. But I gather that Mr. Grundy does not know of the present existence of any such ledge. I confess that I prefer an actual gully to a hypothetical ledge. Re-embarkation is not inconsistent with Thucydides' narrative, though it does assume that there is a slight omission in it. It must be remembered, too, that the impeditamenta of the archers and light armed troops, whom Thucydides expressly says the Messenian captain took with him, were at least not greater than those of a fully equipped Swiss guide of the present day. Mr. Grundy, in several parts of his papers, assumes that soldiers are incapable of climbing any place which presents the least difficulty. I believe on the contrary, that we learn from history that, 'militarily speaking,' no place is impregnable which is not either (1) unclimbable, or (2) defended. In any case I appeal to all climbers, whether it is not far more difficult to proceed horizontally along the face of a cliff than vertically up it. My gully may in places at least almost approximate to a chimney, but Mr. Grundy's ledge would have to be a very secure and obvious one to make progress along it anything like so easy. As regards any change in the nature of the ground, the only suggestion that is likely to help us is Mr. Tozer's, that a path may have existed at the foot of the cliff, by which men could get without re-embarkation from the Panagia landing to the bottom of my gully. This again however is hypothetical, and I see no reason to recede from my previous position.

II. Mr. Grundy's criticisms of my views on the south-east corner of Pylos somewhat confuse the issue. He quotes me as saying, that the east cliff lasts to within a hundred yards of the Sikia channel. Now in the first place my words were 'within perhaps about one hundred yards.'[5] In the second place I was contrasting climbable ground with the 'sheer precipice' to the north of it. In the third place I added in a note 'part of this hundred would only require a slight wall; the half of it immediately abutting on the Sikia channel a strong one.' Mr. Grundy therefore does not prove that my statement was contrary to fact when he says, as a result of his own survey, that 'the cliff is sixty feet high within fifty yards of the Sikia, and ninety feet high within a hundred.' Whether or no, as I still believe, some sort of defence was needed for all this ground, sixty or ninety feet high though it be, is a matter about which I am not now concerned to dispute. The rise in the ground at any rate never approaches the perpendicular.[6]

[1] See *J.H.S.* p. 61. [2] *C.R.*, p. 371.
[3] *J.H.S.*, p. 49. [4] *C.R.*, p. 372.
[5] *J.H.S.*, p. 64.
[6] It is useless for Mr. Grundy to quote against me *J.H.S.*, Plate VIII., Fig. 1. The drawing of the

But it does not affect my argument, whether it was thirty or sixty or one hundred yards which needed some kind of a wall. The number of yards is just the sort of point in which survey can and ought to correct observation. But survey defeats its own objects if it supersedes observation. Has Mr. Grundy forgotten that the ordinary way of entering Pylos is by walking (not climbing) through what I call on another page 'the small space on the eastern side between the Sikia channel and the high cliffs, the point from which the southern sand ridge now stretches across the Lagoon?'[1] This is an easy slope, a scarcely perceptible rise of the ground, and across it a strong wall must have been built. Mr. Grundy must have accounted for this, if he had not, for reasons which I cannot discover, assumed that Demosthenes left outside his defences on the south, south-east, and south-west, a considerable space of ground. If we look at Mr. Grundy's conjectural restoration of the defences,[2] we shall observe that his wall marked BB begins by leaving unprotected at its south-east end the thirty yards adjoining the Sikia channel, and then cuts straight across north-west, leaving more than one hundred yards between it and the shore even before it reaches the low rocks where Brasidas tried to land. I feel inclined to turn the tables on Mr. Grundy and tell him that 'Thucydides would lead us to believe that the whole of the well-defined piece of ground known as Koryphasion was occupied by the Athenians.'[3] It is needless to say that I do not regard this 'turning of the tables' as a serious argument. If there had been as good a reason for Demosthenes' narrowing his line of defence on the south as there was for his narrowing it on the north, no *a priori* conceptions as to the exact boundaries of Coryphasium could stand for a moment in our way. But the two cases are entirely different. The reason for defending the base of the triangle instead of the two sides on the north was that as small a front as possible should be presented to an enemy who could in either case attack in force by land.[4] But if Demosthenes had taken the long base instead of the three short sides of the quadrilateral on the south, he would have been going out of his way to expose himself to what would almost certainly have amounted to a new attack by land. True that the land force on the north could not perhaps at that time have got round to the Sikia channel along the foot of the eastern cliffs.[5] But hoplites and siege engines could have been landed at the extreme south-east corner, and, if the thirty yards of almost level ground were undefended, could have moved round to the west, and opened an attack along the whole line of wall. If this had been Demosthenes' line of defence, Brasidas would have been mad to concentrate his whole attention on an attempt to land on the rocky ground on the south-west.[6] He would have landed also at the south-east, and Demosthenes could not have resisted him. On my theory, however, an attack on the south-east corner was very difficult indeed without siege engines, which the Spartans did not at the time possess. A high wall directly faced them, and though it was not so strongly built as the northern land wall,[7] its length was so inconsiderable that it could be well manned. All along the Sikia channel, too, landing on my theory was impossible, as the wall was built close to the water's edge. On Mr. Grundy's theory, even there determined men could have effected a landing. The wall was far off, and Demosthenes could not have spared men to line the whole coast outside the wall. Once, moreover, that landing was effected, there was a large easy slope before them from which they could direct their attack. Brasidas, therefore, on my theory, and on my theory alone, was limited to the loose low rocks facing the sea at the south-west corner.[8] There, as I have pointed out, landing could only be stopped by men posted outside the wall. Owing to the character of these loose jagged rocks, from fifty to one hundred yards deep, no wall could be built anywhere near the water's edge. I have already noticed of course that there are still existing foundations of Messenian walls following the line I have suggested for those of Demosthenes. It is possible, too, that we can assign one or two of the fragments to the Athenian occupation.[8]

Mr. Grundy will probably meet all this argument with a repetition of his assertion that the south-east corner of Pylos must have been rocky, and that it would have been at least as difficult to land there as along the Sikia channel. His argument however

south-east corner as I before remarked, *J.H.S.* p. 55, is not in the least accurate. The sandbar too is apparently regarded as non-existent.

[1] *J.H.S.*, p. 69.
[2] *Ibid.* Plate II.
[3] *C.R.*, p. 373.
[4] *J.H.S.*, p. 65.
[5] *J.H.S.*, p. 69, note 53.
[6] *Ibid.* p. 64.
[7] Thuc. IV., 9, 2 and *J.H.S.* p. 65, note 36; see also this paper, p. 5.
[8] *J.H.S.*, p. 67.

is invalid. Neither the condition of the sandbar nor that of the cliffs proves that there was no slope at the south-east corner. The present state of the two emissaries, the western of which is about 400, and the eastern about 600 yards from Pylos, points to the fact that it was in their immediate neighbourhood that the sandbar filled in last, and it is unreasonable for Mr. Grundy in his Conjectural Restoration to assume that where there are now two water channels there was then solid land, and where there is now solid land there was then the only water channel.[1]

There is every reason to suppose that sand drifted to the south-east end of Pylos before what we may call the west centre of the sandbar was closed up. There is too, in my opinion, though here perhaps I have no right to dogmatize, a probability that some portion of the slope immediately at the Pylos end of the sandbar belongs to the original formation and is not alluvial deposit at all.[2]

Take again the question of the marking of the cliffs. Grant that generally speaking the south half of the cliff shows signs of having been washed by deep water at a more recent period than the north half. This is as consistent with my theory as with Mr. Grundy's. My slope is not meant to be so long that it would have protected the cliff to its immediate north from the wash of the sea. But does Mr. Grundy really mean to assert that he saw the recent marking on or above my slope? I hardly think he would assert it. His original remarks about the small amount of débris at the foot of the cliffs obviously referred to the high cliffs and not to the slope at all. Indeed he would have to dig through the slope at the point which he thinks was the Channel's west boundary to get at any level of rock which could have been washed by the sea.

Why, it may be asked, is it so important to insist on the existence of this slope? Would it not be enough to prove the impossibility of Mr Grundy's wall BB by the fact that a landing could have been effected, though effected with some difficulty, at several points along the Sikia Channel? True, if this were the only point in dispute. But there are two other important questions which have to be solved. Where did Demosthenes draw up his ships *ὑπὸ τὸ τείχισμα*? And where did the Spartans mean to use their *μηχαναὶ* after their two days' attack by land and sea had failed?

[1] *J.H.S.*, Plate II.

[2] I stated this more unreservedly, *J.H.S.*, p. 69.

In the first place I fail to understand how Mr. Grundy can believe that Demosthenes beached his ships on the south-west, where Brasidas made his attack. It is so astounding a statement that I can scarcely believe it is more than an over-sight.[2] It would be impossible to drag ships over these detached jagged rocks. I defy Mr. Grundy or any one else to drag even a boat across them without knocking several holes in its bottom. Mr. Grundy could find on his own scheme a much more suitable place for the beaching under the wall which he assumes to have run from the north end of the eastern cliff direct to Boidia Koilia. As I place the north Athenian wall far further inland I am debarred from this alternative, and the only place left me is the slope at the south-east corner. But on neither Mr. Grundy's scheme nor mine could a suitable place be found for the proposed use of *μηχαναὶ* if the slope did not exist. The landing of *μηχαναὶ* on the Sikia Channel would be highly improbable, even if it could be called *κατὰ τὸν λίμενα*. Mr. Grundy has to fall back on the sandridge by Boidia Koilia. Is this a possibility? That landing could be effected there is obvious. That siege engines could be used there is no less obvious. But this is not the point. Thucydides tells us that for two days the Spartans attacked on the south-west by sea and on the north by land, and then in despair sent to Asine for timber, *ἐλπίζοντες τὸ κατὰ τὸν λιμένα τεῖχος ὕψος μὲν ἔχειν, ἀποβάσεως δὲ μάλιστα οὔσης ἐλεῖν μηχαναῖς*.[4] Surely it is clear that it is a new point that is to be attacked? Surely *τὸ κατά τὸν λιμένα τεῖχος*, a phrase till now unused, cannot refer to the parts *πρὸς τὴν ἤπειρον*[5] which had already been attacked in vain? It must be a point which can only be reached by men disembarking from the fleet. If it were the same point which had already been attacked by the land force, and could be attacked by them again, there would be no sense in the use of the word *ἀπόβασις*. Mr. Grundy, however, would reply that it is the disembarkation of the engines which is referred to. But if the word *ἀπόβασις* could bear such a meaning we should be making Thucydides give a strange and unnecessary reason for the possible success of the engines. Of course, engines could be landed so as to be put at the service of the land army, but even if the coast had been

[3] *J.H.S.* pp. 17 and 25.

[4] Thuc. IV., 13, 1.

[5] *Ibid.* 9, 2.

rocky close to where that army was making its attack, that fact would not have stood in the way of the use of engines. There was no break in the land connection, and the engines could have been brought by land carriage from any point on the coast. It is improbable, too, that the engines came ready made. What was sent for was timber, and it would have in any case to be disembarked by the Spartan camp and made up into battering-rams. These would then be carried by land to Boidia Koilia. But we need not rest on such unsubstantial arguments. As a question of scholarship, the word ἀπόβασις cannot bear the transitive meaning of disembarking a piece of goods. It can only be intransitive, and refer to a man's own disembarkation. The Greek cannot mean that at this point engines could be disembarked in order that a land force might use them, but that men could only reach the place and use engines there by disembarkation. That is to say, the place was not accessible by land. It may, perhaps, be asked why the engines, when once procured, should not have been used on the land side. Would not that be the obvious place? Could not many more engines be used there, and many more men work them? For our answer we must turn to Thucydides' description of the Athenian fortifications. It was the wall on the mainland side which he himself tells us was the best fortified.[1] Against this wall the Spartans had already spent themselves to no purpose. It had proved its strength. Even engines would be of little use against it. But all the parts of Pylos which were inaccessible by land were meagrely and partially fortified. Only one small part of these walls was even moderately formidable. This did, indeed, rise to some considerable height. It was not the mere rough breastwork that tempted Brasidas to attack on the south-west. But it was not sufficiently strong to withstand a battering-ram if such could be brought to bear. When land-attack and sea-attack were disconnected no place was more difficult to storm. But if a land attack could be directed from the sea, no place would be more easy.

III. As regards the defences on the north, I have not much to add to what was said in my original paper. My distances are no more inaccurate[2] than they were in the case of the south-east corner. The point on which Mr. Grundy and I really differ is this, whether ground which is steep and moderately high, but not unclimbable, can be safely left unguarded by a wall when the garrison is too small to admit of efficient sentry duty. The remains of the walls on Ithome bear me out in my general theory; and, applying it to the present case, I find that the two sides of the triangle, if not protected by a fairly continuous wall, would have been most insecure, especially from night attack. I believe, then, that any general who had to choose his ground, and was limited as regards time and men, would prefer the line which I have suggested, the more especially as he would be far better able to maintain his communications with his other divisions on the south and south-west.

That my wall on the north-west is on a steep slope does not give any reason for rejecting it. If there is one thing certain about the wall which now stands there, it is this, that it is a wall of defence. It cannot be claimed as anything but a piece of fortification. The difficulty therefore which Mr. Grundy suggests as inherent in the defence of a wall built on a slope, must have held true for whoever built that wall, and therefore cannot be pleaded as a reason for not ascribing it to Demosthenes. As a matter of fact Mr. Grundy's argument, 'militarily speaking,' is incorrect. The slope of the ground would not under the conditions presupposed play into the hands of the attacking party. In the days of short range missiles, the assailants, unable to take up a safe position near the wall, could do little or no accurate work in the way of enfilading. But the defenders, safe under cover of their wall, could make the lower half of the slope untenable for an attacking force. The advantage of the ground would indeed amply compensate for an inferiority of numbers. On the other hand Mr. Grundy's argument does hold good for the days of long range missiles, when an attacking force on the upper part of the slope could itself take advantage of cover, and secure at a distance from the wall a good position for picking off those of the garrison who were beneath it. The later then, the period, the nearer we come to our own times, the less likely was such a wall to be built.

As regards the *a priori* possibility of such a wall being partially preserved till the present day, I can only remark that all over Greece there have been equally strange survivals. The fact is that when we talk about Frankish and Venetian castles, about stormy days, and fierce sieges, we forget that

[1] See above, page 3. [2] *C.R.*, p. 372.

these are not the things which obliterate the landmarks of history. It is the peaceful, commercial habits of a large and continuous population. And that is a thing which Greece has never had from the Roman times to the present day. Indeed the destruction only last year for commercial reasons of the magnificent and perfectly preserved Venetian walls at Nauplia points the moral. If it were not for conscious archaeological sentiment the peaceful prosperity of the present decade would work more destruction than the thousand years before it. To any one who has travelled at all widely in Greece, the impression left on the mind comes finally to be, no longer wonder that a thing has survived, but surprise if it has not. I am perfectly prepared on grounds of style to acknowledge, if need be, that the wall now standing is not of Athenian construction. But in that case I should still maintain my *a priori* strategical position. It is interesting to note that the explanation of the word Βουφράς as referring to Boidia Koilia becomes even more plausible on my theory of the walls. It is odd, as Curtius evidently felt, that the Athenians should, 'during an armistice, have been so closely confined within their walls.' But it is also, as Mr. Grundy points out, most improbable that they would have been allowed to have the run of a large extent of Messenia, as would have been the case if Tomaion was the name of a mountain seven miles off.[1] On my theory these difficulties disappear. The Athenians were allowed to go beyond their walls, and use the considerable space of open ground that stretched between them and Boidia Koilia. But they were not allowed to occupy country in which their presence would have proved a perpetual annoyance to the Spartans.

IV. We now turn to a new point. What was the condition of the present lagoon? What was the harbour? What were the two entrances to which Thucydides often refers? On this point Mr. Grundy does not seem to grasp the point of issue. He assumes that I differ fundamentally from him as to the condition of the southern sandbar, and that this is the question which it is important to discuss. My theory as to the identification of the two channels, he dismisses in a few words, and does not bring it into contrast with his own.[2] But, as I shall attempt to prove, we need differ scarcely at all as to the Lagoon or the southern sandbar. But our theories as to the two channels involve our whole conception as to the course of the great battle in the harbour, and our estimate of Thucydides' method of work as a historian. So far from being an unimportant question, it is perhaps the most important question in the whole subject.

First, then, as regards the southern sandbar. Mr. Grundy believes that the lagoon formation had, at the time of which we are writing, proceeded just so far as to form the southern sandbank within a comparatively short distance of Pylos, but not so far as to render the inner basin thus enclosed unnavigable for large ships. But what is the reason which makes him go thus far, and no further? It is, I think, not unfair on him to say that it is not a geological consideration as to the exact amount of time necessary for the deposit of a certain amount of earth. He has not made the sandbar stop two hundred yards away from Pylos, because only so much earth could have been formed by then, and only so much since then. He has placed the western end of the sandbar where he places it, for no other reason than because such a state of things fits in with his preconceived theory as to the Spartan defence of the harbour, and is not incompatible with the geological probabilities. Neither Mr. Grundy nor anyone else could claim to give exact dates for the various stages of lagoon formation.[3] His strategical theories lead him to assume that the mouth of the inner basin was narrow enough to make its defence by a chain of ships practicable. Has he a right, then, to appeal against my theory to geological reasons, when my theory only differs from his in this, that the sandbar must on it have been sufficiently remote from completion to allow the inner basin to seem an integral part of the whole harbour? This is the whole point of my theory. I may have stated it in terms which seemed to imply that the sandbar was altogether absent.[4] If I did so it was because I had come to the conclusion that the only geological certainty was that the process of change was from sea to lagoon, from water to land, and not vice versa. But, as my treatment of other alternative theories showed, if my historical and strategical points of view had led me to the conclusion that the lagoon was then in practically the same state as it is to-day, I should not have felt that geological considerations were strong enough to invalidate

[1] *J.H.S.*, p. 18, note 23. [2] *C.R.*, p. 373.

[3] His original statement, *J.H.S.*, pp. 7–13, carefully avoids such attempts at dating.

[4] *J.H.S.*, p. 70.

them.[1] As a matter of fact, my point of view only demands that there should be somewhat less of a sandbar than that assumed by Mr. Grundy. It would be satisfied, for instance, as I have hinted in another connection,[2] if water ran from the east of the two emissaries now existing to the slope at the south-east corner of Pylos; if, that is to say, the entrance to the inner basin was six hundred yards broad, instead of two hundred, as Mr. Grundy would make it. Now, can Mr. Grundy date the lagoon formation with such accuracy that he can assert that it is impossible for six hundred yards of sandbar to have been formed, in 2,200 years, but probable that two hundred were so formed? Considering that on either hypothesis we have to assume the filling up of the whole large acreage of the lagoon, its change from a navigable harbour to a shallow marsh, it is obvious that the difference between the two hundred and the six hundred yards of sandbar is the merest trifle, in regard to which our limited knowledge of the time taken in lagoon formation can give us no help whatever.

My theory, then, cannot be upset by *a priori* geology. On these grounds it is just as tenable as Mr. Grundy's. It is from the historical and strategical points of view that we have to choose between them. Here, then, we come to Mr. Grundy's inadequate treatment of my theory of the two channels. There are in his original paper few points more prominent, and, if sound, more valuable, than his theory of the battle in the harbour. It is the regulating idea of his whole paper. The double use of the word harbour, the dovetailing of the accounts given by the two informants, are not only threads which run through his whole narrative, throwing light now on one point, now on another, but afford a clue to Thucydides' historical method and influence our judgment on Greek history in general.

Mr. Grundy's theory then must be examined carefully and on its merits, and he must not refuse to do the same with mine. He cannot be allowed to dispose of it by calling it an 'hypothesis founded on an hypothesis.' It must be remembered, in the first place, that Mr. Grundy and I are agreed that Thucydides must have made some mistake. No one who ever has visited, or ever will visit, the spot can doubt that alike in description of fact and in suggestion of motive and intention Thucydides gives a misleading account of the battle in the harbour. Whatever solution, then, a modern historian proposes for the present difficulty must at best be an hypothesis. So must any emendation of a classical text. But there are hypotheses and hypotheses, emendations and emendations, some wildly improbable, some practical certainties. We cannot dispose of a view, then, by calling it a hypothesis. We must first ask how many hypotheses satisfy the negative test of being consistent with the topography. And, secondly, which of these best satisfies the positive test of containing within it the seeds of its own corruption, of explaining the reasons which led Thucydides to misunderstand it in the particular way he did.

What is the misleading account, the growth of which we have to explain? It is briefly this.[3] The Peloponnesian fleet was in a harbour, which had two entrances, one on the side of Pylos, the second looking to the other part of the mainland. The island of Sphacteria stretched across the harbour, and made the entrances narrow. You could sail through the first with two ships abreast, through the second with eight or nine. The Peloponnesians intended to block them and prevent the Athenian fleet entering the harbour. When, however, the attack was made, the entrances were not closed, and it was through both of them that the Athenians entered the harbour. The Athenians subsequently blockaded Sphacteria, and finally decided to land and attack its garrison. With this object they landed troops on the extreme south of the island, both from the sea and on the side of the harbour.

How does Mr. Grundy propose to reconstruct the story? In his original paper he stated that 'after seeing the locality it is not possible to doubt that Boidia Koilia and the Sikia channels are the channels to which Thucydides refers.'[4] This was an astounding statement, considering that on his own hypothesis the Boidia Koilia channel was at that time a blind alley, through which ships could not get into the harbour at all. Such a theory could indeed only be reasonably held by one who believed with Arnold that Boidia Koilia was an open channel, that Hagio Nicolo was Thucydides' Pylos, and our Pylos his Sphacteria. I cannot help feeling that the idea of Boidia Koilia being one of the two channels, was a survival from that Arnoldian Hagio Nicolo stage in Mr. Grundy's evolution, to which he elsewhere

[1] *J.H.S.*, pp. 68–72.
[2] Page 4 of this paper.
[3] Thuc. IV., 8, 5–7; 13, 4; 14, 1; 31, 1.
[4] *J.H.S.*, p. 21.

alludes.[1] He soon saw that Arnold's theory was impossible, but failed to discard a detail which was really appropriate to it, and to it alone. As it was he had to give the lame explanation that the Spartans blocked Boidia Koilia because the Athenian fleet might otherwise have occupied the sandbar in force.[2] He forgot that if the Athenians had been able to beat the Spartan army on land, they could have got at them by landing on Pylos[3] and swarming over their own North Wall. But as a matter of fact the whole course of the narrative makes it clear that the Spartans never dreamed of fearing an Athenian attack by land. Mr. Grundy got into difficulties too about the Sikia channel. He saw that blocking the Sikia would not mean blocking the inner harbour. A fleet could move round through the channel south of Sphacteria, and enter the inner harbour, without paying any attention to the Sikia and its chain of ships. So Mr. Grundy had to invent a third blocking, a blocking of this south approach to the inner harbour. A reference to his map[4] will thus show three chains of ships, one blocking Boidia Koilia, another the Sikia Channel, and another the channel between the north-east of Sphacteria and the south-west of the southern sandbar.

It is not necessary, however, to pick to pieces this theory of a triple blocking. Mr. Grundy has himself retracted it in an addendum printed at the end of the special copies of his paper, and dated October, 1896. I am only surprised that he has not alluded to it in his contribution to the *Classical Review*. In this addendum he states that he now abandons any idea that Boidia Koilia was blocked, and believes that the two other channels were those to which Thucydides refers. We may take this, then, as Mr. Grundy's final view, that the two channels which the Spartans meant to block, and, if we are to believe him, did for a time block, were (1) the Sikia Channel, (2) the channel between the southern sandbar and Sphacteria.

This theory is a distinct improvement on the other, but it is strange that it did not occur to Mr. Grundy that it is open to an obvious and damaging piece of criticism. If the object of the Spartans was to prevent the Athenians from getting into the inner harbour, why did they not block the mouth of that harbour itself? Why did they go out of their way to defend the two sides instead of the base of the triangle? A glance at Mr. Grundy's map, if not an elementary knowledge of Euclid, will show that on only one condition could such a proceeding be conceivable, and that is if some important advantage of the ground could thus be gained. But can Mr. Grundy point me out in this case a single advantage? The Spartans would have chosen for the mooring of their chain of ships two channels exposed to wind and current instead of one channel comparatively well protected. And the difficulty of covering the ground with the ships at their disposal would have been greatly increased. I myself once thought of this explanation, and rejected it for the reasons just given.

The theory which in my paper I *did* suggest as an alternative to that which I ultimately adopted, avoided at any rate, this difficulty.[5] For it assumed that the sandbank ran further to the south, to the Turtori rocks or the Sphagia shoal, so that the rules about the length of the sides of a triangle do not apply, and it would be natural and economical to block two entrances instead of one. But to this view, as I pointed out, there is the strong geological objection that it is most improbable that the sandbank could have so entirely changed its position.

There is another serious flaw in Mr. Grundy's theory. We have still got to account for the comparative breadth which Thucydides assigns to the two entrances.

Here is a definite detail which must have got into his mind somehow or other. We have no right to disregard it. It is just such a detail, the presence of which in a corrupt passage of an otherwise trustworthy text, must be satisfactorily accounted for by any restoration that claims our respect. Yet Mr. Grundy boldly disregards it. Whether or no on his original hypothesis he meant the breadth of the two southern channels combined to bear roughly the right proportion to that of Boidia Koilia, I cannot tell. His diagram represents five ships as blocking the latter, and four and nine the two former. He has not noticed, at any rate, in his 'Addendum,' that his change of view destroys any approximation

[1] *J.H.S.*, p. 13. Not only would the channel be navigable on Arnold's Theory, but it would be made narrow by 'Sphacteria.' According to Mr. Grundy's identification of Sphacteria the island would have nothing to do with the entrance, which would make Thucydides guilty of a still further blunder.

[2] *J.H.S.*, p. 22.

[3] This they could easily have done, with no enemy to oppose them.

[4] *J.H.S.*, Plate II.

[5] *J.H.S.*, p. 71.

to the right proportions. His map[1] does not attempt to make one entrance allow a passage for two ships, and another for eight or nine. His distances are rather in the ratio of two to three than of two to eight. But, supposing that Mr. Grundy cuts a slice off the sandbar, and brings the channels into their right proportion, he will not thereby avoid his difficulties. Once the eastern channel is made four times the breadth of the Sikia, the incredibility of the Spartans wasting ships over two entrances when they had barely enough for one is brought even closer home to us. If I were inclined to accept Mr. Grundy's theory of the blocking, I should still have to rely on my theory of the origin of the two numbers. I should believe that here, again, there was confusion between the two informants, and that Thucydides connected the numbers with which the Athenians actually did enter the south entrance of the bay, with the breadth of the channel between the sandbar and Sphacteria. But is this theory of Mr. Grundy's, with its creation of two entrances, where only one was natural, its double use of the word harbour, and its double use of the word entrance, any less hypothetical or difficult than mine? It is certainly not less hypothetical. To me, at any rate, it seems far more difficult. It would be tedious if I repeated the explanation I gave in my original paper.[2] I have nothing to add to it. I can only ask my readers to judge if it does not honestly and easily account for the smallest details of Thucydides' mistake. Mr. Grundy's theory, if otherwise possible, would be superior to it in only one respect, that it would allow that the entrances were narrow and capable of being blocked.

He might urge however that when I make Thucydides guilty of a serious mistake on this point I have no right to pose as his champion; that it is no more possible on my theory than on his that Thucydides can have visited the spot.

In respect to this I would answer that narrowness and width are not absolute terms, and that mistakes in measurements are the very mistakes which observation and memory make, and survey and maps avoid. But, I would say further, that it is a gratuitous assumption on Mr. Grundy's part to suppose that the blocking of the channels ever actually took place. If the channels had been blocked the first evening that the Athenian fleet arrived, Thucydides could scarcely have said that they found the island and mainland occupied by troops, ἔν τε τῷ λιμένι οὔσας τὰς ναῦς καὶ οὐκ ἐκπλεούσας.[3] Thucydides knew how to describe the blocking of a harbour's mouth, and his choice of words here definitely precludes such an interpretation.

On my theory, Thucydides is not confused as to the general topography. There is only one harbour, and there are only two entrances. All he does is that he combines an Athenian fact with a Spartan excuse. He does not remember that the southern entrance was too broad for that Spartan excuse to hold good, and that the number of ships abreast with which the Athenians entered it did not really lend it support. I think, then, that this sort of mistake is possible for a man who has visited the spot, but has not written up his narrative or collected all his evidence till he has left it. It would be compatible even with the possession of a rough sketch map. I have no wish to insist on the fact that Thucydides must have visited the spot. I have suggested it because I can scarcely believe that the account of the battle on Sphacteria was written from hearsay evidence. But I most strongly maintain that the mistake in which Thucydides is thus involved differs entirely from that attributed to him by Mr. Grundy. On Mr. Grundy's theory Thucydides is completely confused as to the topography of the whole region. He would scarcely have known it if he had had gone to it with his own MS. in his hand. He jumbles together his two informants' accounts without the least sifting. He can never have demanded from them the roughest of diagrams.

V. Let us conclude with our respective explanations of the mistake in the length of Sphacteria. Mr. Grundy must not imagine that I tie myself down to a theory of textual corruption, of a change of κε′ to ιε′, or of ΔΔΓ to ΔΓ. I own that I think the balance of probability is on that side. I am quite willing, however, to admit that Thucydides here again may have made just that sort of mistake which is natural for memory relying on observation. But for Mr. Grundy's 'topographical explanation' I can find no 'intrinsic evidence' whatever in the pages of Thucydides. Mr. Grundy assumes without any warrant that the

[1] *J.H.S.*, Plate II. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 73–76.

[3] Thuc. IV., 13, 3. Mr. Grundy, *J.H.S.*, pp. 30–32, apparently thinks ἐν τῷ λιμένι refers to the ships blocking the eastern of the two channels. Here, then, even the first informant used λιμήν in a double sense! For these ships were not in the inner harbour.

southern Spartan outpost was stationed about nine stades from the south end of the island. With scarcely more warrant he assumes that the Athenians, when they landed on the harbour side to attack the outpost, were also about nine stades distant from the south end.[1] He then asks us to believe that the distance between these positions and the Sikia Channel was mistaken by Thucydides for the total length of the island. Has it occurred to Mr. Grundy to wonder with what possible object the Spartans or Athenians should have taken measurements from these points to the northern end of the island? When had they to walk, or sail, the distance? Who could have cared to estimate it at all, except, indeed, an observer who was at the moment intending to point out that it was not the whole of the island which the Spartans occupied? We are asked, then, to believe that Thucydides was so bad an historian that he never noticed the point which a measurement was deliberately intended to bring out, but went out of his way to use it in a perversely different sense.

Notice the difference between such a mistake and that which I have suggested as the reason for his only allowing a passage of eight or nine ships abreast through the southern entrance. The number of ships abreast with which the Athenian fleet entered the harbour would be remembered naturally, and without special effort, by any of its responsible commanders. They would not in their thoughts connect it in any way, for truth or falsehood, with the breadth of the entrance, because their knowledge was not acquired with reference to that question. Thucydides, therefore, would get no warning or caution from his informants, and his mistaken inference does not stamp him as incompetent. But the measurement of the island from the Athenian landing place or the Spartan outpost must, if made at all, have been consciously made with a definite object in view, and the fact would be passed on in its entirety, unless the historian was either incompetent or, what is perhaps the same thing, content to take it third or fourth hand. This is not 'intrinsic evidence.' Far better to frankly allow that Thucydides, before the days of surveys, made an error in measurement. Still better to accept the sane and moderate reconstruction of the text, which Mr. Clark first proposed.

In conclusion, I apologise once again if I have appeared over polemical, and assure Mr. Grundy that no one can realize more fully than I do the importance and permanent value of his excellent survey.

RONALD M. BURROWS.

[1] It is not certain where the Athenians landed. It is impossible to learn in which direction they had to move to reach this first outpost.

[This reply was received towards the end of November, but too late for publication in the December number.—G. E. M.]

A NOTE ON THE DATE OF TYRTAEUS, AND THE MESSENIAN WAR.

IN a passage from the orator Lycurgus (*c. Leocrat.* §§ 102–102) quoted by Dr. A. W. Verrall in a recent number of this *Review* (vol. x. No. 6. pp. 269 *ff*) an approximate date is given for the *floruit* of Tyrtaeus, for the Messenian War with which his name is associated, and for the poems, or poetic fragments, which bear his name. Dr. Verrall has attempted to prove that the date in question is placed by Lycurgus after the Persian Wars, that the Messenian War in question must therefore be the 'third' Messenian War (*circa* 464–454 B.C.), and that the literary character of the poems in question confirms this hypothesis. It is the object of the present note to show that this novel hypothesis is unacceptable.

(*a*) *The date of Tyrtaeus.* Tyrtaeus, the Messenian War in which he served (or led) the Spartans, his poetry and the use made of it in Spartan education, all these points, Lycurgus *l.c.* undoubtedly dates with reference to the Persian Wars, and as undoubtedly dates them all before, and not after, the Persian Wars. This statement will be self-evident to anyone who considers the passage translated from Lycurgus by Dr. Verrall, and considers it in its entirety. The orator asserts that at Thermopylae the Spartans, by their heroism, showed the effects of the poems of Tyrtaeus upon their education, and were enabled to dispute with Athens the primacy, or lead, gained by the Athenians at Marathon, where Athens had acted as the champion of Hellas against the 'barbarians.' Dr. Verrall in explaining the

passage from Lycurgus has post-dated and unduly extended the competition for the primacy, or *hegemony*, between Athens and Sparta, as conceived by the orator. There is not a word in the passage cited, nor in the context, about Salamis, or the development of the Confederacy of Delos: and unless Dr. Verrall dates the defence of Thermopylae to the year 445 B.C. he should not have represented the argument of Lycurgus as running to the effect that 'Sparta from about B.C. 445 began to dispute that pre-eminence of Athens [displayed at Marathon] by virtue of an education adopted'—from Tyrtaeus after the Messenian War.

(*b*) *The date of the Messenian War.* It is 'now surely manifest beyond all possibility of debate' that the Messenian War with which Tyrtaeus is associated by Lycurgus *l.c.* cannot be a Messenian War subsequent to the defence of Thermopylae; nor is any such hypothesis necessary to explain the mention of Tyrtaeus and the Messenian war after the first mention of Marathon and the Athenian championship of Hellas upon that field. Lycurgus is a rhetorician defending a thesis not an historian chronicling a series of events. Lycurgus does not specify how many years before Thermopylae Tyrtaeus lived and wrote, but he must be understood to allow sufficient time after the Messenian War in question for Tyrtaeus to have passed away, bequeathing to Sparta his poems, and 'a system of discipline,' in virtue of which the Spartan people of later days, 'which was in the habit of hearing this poetry, was so disposed to bravery, that they disputed [in the lines of Thermopylae] the primacy which Athens had asserted at Marathon.' In order to prove that Lycurgus dates the Messenian War before the Persian War, it is not necessary in explaining the words τοῖς ἀνδρειοτάτοις Λακεδαιμονίοις ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις πολεμοῦσι πρὸς Μεσσηνίους ἀνεῖλεν ὁ θεὸς παρ' ἡμῶν ἡγεμόνα λαβεῖν to take ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις with πολεμοῦσι. The era of the Messenian War is obtainable, as above shown, from the context, irrespective of these words. And, however these words be taken, they in no case contradict a date for the Messenian War before the Persian War. Dr. Verrall discusses four alternative ways of understanding them, nor am I sure that he has exhausted all the legitimate possibilities of the case. One question is, whether the words 'in former times' are to be construed with ἀνδρειοτάτοις or with the verbs πολεμοῦσι...ἀνεῖλεν. Another question is, whether in *former* priority is measured in relation to the date of the speech or in relation to events narrated, or implied, in the immediate context. If *former* is relative to *the date of the speech*, it manifestly leaves the date of the Messenian War an open question, so far as this sentence is concerned, while the context, as above shown, fixes the Messenian War at some date before the Persian War. If *former* is relative to *events narrated or implied in the immediate context*, then manifestly it dates the Delphic response, the Messenian War, or, it may be, the whileome courage of the Lacedaemonians, before Marathon and the Persian War. I am captivated by Dr. Verrall's preference for the grammatical connexion of ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις with ἀνδρειοτάτοις, and on such a point I defer gladly to his admirable scholarship: but on the material interpretation of the words I venture to suggest that the 'prior bravery' of the Spartans is to be conceived as preceding, not the Persian War—that goes without saying—but the Messenian War, in which notoriously, or *ex hypothesi*, the Spartans were at first defeated and their reputation for 'martial qualities' discredited, and only thereafter restored by the advent and the influence of Tyrtaeus. The argument would then run that in days of yore the Spartans no doubt were very brave fellows, but all the same, when fighting Messenians they were worsted, until the god directed them to take an Athenian, to be their leader (ἡγεμόνα), under promise of victory, if they did so. The Spartan lack, or loss, of bravery was shown by their requiring a leader from outside in order to defeat the Messenians. There are, perhaps, other exegetical possibilities in the sentence, but none—so far as I see—that require us to date the Messenian War, or the revival of Spartan prowess, after the Persian Wars—a date which would indeed be wholly inconsistent with the remainder of the passage.

(*c*) *The date of the Poems.* Dr. Verrall finds some support for his conclusion in the literary character of the extant fragments ascribed to Tyrtaeus. He points out the improbability of the belief that 'in Lacedaemonia, a century before Solon, popular audiences were regaled' with such poems as the poems of Tyrtaeus, to judge by the extant remains, appear to have been. So be it: but surely the better inference would be that the fragments are, in whole or in part, wrongly ascribed to Tyrtaeus and not that Tyrtaeus was 'a contemporary of Sophocles.' It would be a real service to Greek history if Dr. Verrall could be persuaded to give us a study *on the authenticity of the Fragments ascribed to Tyrtaeus*, such for example as we

have just received from M. Hauvette, upon the authenticity of the *Épigrammes* ascribed to Simonides. But he must proceed upon the hypothesis that the real Tyrtaeus, whatever his nativity and franchise, was not a contemporary of Sophocles: he must resign the theses that 'Lycurgus dates Tyrtaeus not in the seventh century B.C. but in the fifth, and that the Messenian War, with which the name of Tyrtaeus was associated, is the 'third' Messenian War, *circa* 464–454 B.C. What precise dates Lycurgus would have assigned to Tyrtaeus and to the Messenian Wars, is another question. If anyone maintains that Lycurgus expressly places Tyrtaeus in the seventh century B.C., I promise Dr. Verrall an easy victory over him. The true dates, and the true story of the earlier Messenian Wars, so far as recoverable, cannot here be discussed, nor even the genesis of the later romance, which Pausanias preserves for us: but it may be suggested that Grote came short in tracing the legend no further back than the foundation of Messene in 369 B.C. We have some pretty clear indications that the 'story,' as distinct from the 'tradition,' of the Messenian Wars was already generated and flourishing before the end of the fifth century, and we may feel pretty sure that the hero Aristomenes, or his legend, had already done good service against Sparta before the middle of that century.

REGINALD W. MACAN.

CONTESTED ETYMOLOGIES.

I.—LATIN *ingens* 'HUGE.'

§ 1. FOR *ingens* I find two etymologies current. One proceeds from Danielsson (Pauli's *Altital. Stud.* iv. 149) who posits an Aryan base **n̥ĝn̥-t-* 'unknown' = Eng. *uncouth*. Schulze (*K.Z.* 28, 281) independently compares Ir. *ingnād* 'wunderbar.' This etymology is mentioned without definite acceptance by Brugmann, *Gr.* ii. § 123, and accepted by Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.* p. 274. Another etymology advocated by Bréal (Bréal et Bailly's *Dict. Etym. Lat.* s.v. and *Mém. Soc. Ling.* ix. 42) derives *ingens* from √*ĝen* 'become' compounded with an indeterminate preposition. Neither of these etymologies is conclusive regarding the signification of *ingens*, for 'uncouth' does not mean 'huge,' nor is there question of a *-to-* stem in the Latin word.

§ 2. I would therefore compare *ingens* with Sk. *mahánt* 'large' <Aryan **n̥ĝh-ént-*, recognizing gradation of course for the suffix *-ent-*. In Sanskrit we should expect **ahánt*, but *máhi* 'great,' and *máhas* 'greatness,' were influential to check gradation, though in Greek we have *ἄγαν* 'much, very.' I can see no reason why this explanation, which suits both the sense and inflexion, is not preferable to either of the others. That *ingens* is but an emphatic *magnus* is proved by Ter. *Eun.* 391: Magnas vero agere gratias Thais mihi? GN. Ingentis: on which Cicero (*Lael.* 98) makes the comment: satis erat respondere magnas. The only previous comparison of *ingens* and *mahánt* I can find in the literature accessible to me proceeds from Bury, *B.B.* 7, 82, where it is not clear whether he makes claim to it as new or not.

§ 3. Even in Sanskrit we have, I believe, a trace of the stem **n̥ĝh-*. In a stanza of the wedding hymn, *R.V.* 10, 85, 13 (= *A.V.* 14, 1, 13) we have the form *aghásu*, but *A.V. maghá-su*. Now *maghásu* means 'in the month of *maghá*,' while *aghásu* means 'in the evil [-month].' Weber (*Abhandl. Ak. Wiss. Berlin*, 1861, p. 364) believes that *aghásu* was a *mala fide* alteration of *maghásu*, for our stanza prescribes a sacrifice of cows preparatory to the bridal procession, and the cow subsequently grew to have a sacrosanct character. This reasoning would be more valid if the alteration assumed had taken place in *A.V.*, which is the more superstitious volume.

§ 4. The month of *Maghā* was sacred to the Manes, and, though its *-gh-* is probably a 'velar,' it is not to be separated from *mah-* in *pitāmahá-s* 'Manes' (cf. *mah-é pitr-é*, dat. sg., used of a dead ancestor in *R.V.* 1 71, 5; 6 20, 11; see *P.W.* s.v. *pitāmahá-*). The velar is also warranted in Goth. *manags*, O. Bulg. *mŭnogŭ* 'much' beside Sk. *máṅha-te* 'is large, generous,' *maghá-m* 'fulness, riches' (v. Brug. *Gr.* ii. § 596, 5), if these have an infixed *-na-*. On the interchange of 'velars' and 'palatals' I refer to Noreen, *Urgerm. Lautlehre*, § 55, and the literature there cited. Inasmuch as the Roman and Hindu cults of the Manes are equally well developed (cf. Schrader *Sprachvergleichung*[2]

p. 612) we must heed the correspondence of *Maghā* and Lat. *Māius*, a month also sacred to the Manes (Ovid, *Fasti*, v. 421; cf. the author, *Proc. Am. Phil. Assoc.*, July 1894, p. ix.).[1]

II.—Latin *immanis*.

§ 1. Lewis and Short's *Lexicon* gives the still current derivation (cf. Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.* p. 339) from *in* + *mānus* 'good,' but defines 1° as 'monstrous in size,' 2° 'monstrous in character.' Thus the definition and etymology are not in accord, and, *pace* Schweizer-Sidler (*K.Z.* 14, 153), I accept the definition rather than the etymology, and propose instead to connect *immānis* with *ingens* 'huge' and *magnus* 'great,' from a base **m̥ghn-*, with a primitive Italic gen. **m̥gn-es.* > **immănis* with anaptyptic *ă*; the lengthening of the *ă* was due to association with *inānis* 'empty, trivial,' *vesānus* 'fierce' (Plaut. *Trin.* 826), and the class of adjectives in *-āno* (cf. V. Henry, *Gram. Comp.*[2] § 158).

§ 2. There is difficulty however with the phonetics, for the change, primitive Ital. *g^{w}n* > Lat. *mn*, has not yet been generally recognized. In *Proc. Am. Phil. Assoc.* Dec. 1894, p. lii. I have brought together a number of examples to support this law. Tolerably certain seem to me the following, based mainly on variants due to *r/n* inflexion: (1) *umor* 'water' (gen. **ug^{w}nos*): ὑγρός 'moist'; (2) *fluv-ius: flum-en* (gen. **flug^{w}-nos*); (3) *ruc-tus* 'belching': *rum-en* 'throat'; (4) *fem-ur*, gen. *femĭnis* 'thigh': Sk. *bāh-ús* 'fore-foot'; (5) *vom-er* 'ploughshare': O.H.G. *wag-anso;* (6) *omentum* 'fat': *unguen* 'ointment.' I have also shown there how the surviving cases of *gn*< Aryan *gn*, may be due in most cases to the etymological consciousness. The best explanation I could then offer for *ignis* 'fire' instead of **imnis* was rhyming association with *lignum* 'fire-wood.' To the Romans *ignis* meant 'lightning' (cf. Lucret. vi. 80), and so was cognate, as they thought, with *ictus* 'stroke,' which I take to be a ptc. to *iacĕre* 'strike.' Thus in one sentence Lucretius (vi. 309-316) uses *ignis* and *ictus* three times each in a description of the lightning. Further the phrase *subicere ignem* is so common as almost to suggest the figura etymologica. Beside *fulgoris ictus* 'lightning stroke' (*ib.* vi. 316) stands *fulmineus ignis* (*ib.* ii. 382). Vergil (Aen. x. 177) has praesagi fulminis ignes. From a somewhat later period Ovid may be cited for *Iovis ignibus ictus* (*Trist.* I. iii. 77). Out of this association the abnormal phonetics of *ignis* can be explained. If we bear in mind that the Vedic Agni was lightning, it is fair to connect the word with √*aj* 'drive, shoot,' and define as 'dart, darter'; compare Lat. *iacere* 'shoot': *ictus* 'stroke of lightning.' If this kinship with √*aj* be correct[2] then Sk. *agní*, O.Bg. *ogni* have *a-* and not *o-*; in Lith. *ugnìs* there has been a deflection in the initial vowel caused by *usnìs* 'burning nettle': √*us-* 'burn,' or we may see in *ugnìs* the phonetic continuant of Sk. *váhni*, a standing epithet of Agni in *R.V.*, and later a regular name for fire—in the pre-accentual grade to be sure. The difficulty in connecting *agní* with √*aj-* is that the former has a 'velar,' and the latter a 'palatal.' For this condition see above.[3]

§ 3. Returning from this digression, I claim that if *gn* > Latin *mn* be a correct induction there is no phonetic obstacle to connecting *immanis* with *ingens* as above set forth. As to signification *immanis* is like our 'enormity,' German *grösse*, taken *in malum sensum*.

III.—*Manus* 'good'; *di Mānes*.

§ 1. Among the Romans Varro connected *mānus* with *māne* 'in the morning.'[4] Schweizer<Sidler>(*K.Z.* 2, 73 compared Sk. *mṛdu*, Lat. *mollis*, rejecting a suggestion of Schwenk that *mānus* was a byform of *magnus* 'great.' Ascoli (*K.Z.* 17, 275,) debates this same etymology for *Mānes* as well as *mānus*. For the phonetics he compares *vēna* 'vein, channel' (Grk. ὀχετός 'canal') <**veh-na*, i.e. **veg-na*. In *Proc. Am. Phil. Assoc.* July, 1894, p. x. I independently made the same suggestion for *Mānes*, reporting the following examples of primitive Ital. *gn* > Lat. *n* in isolated words: *fēnum* 'hay': φαγεῖν 'eat'; *fēnus* 'interest': Sk. √*bhaj-* 'share'; *lēno*

[1] The relation of *Maius* to the name *Magius* and to *maior* was seen by Aufrecht, *K.Z.* 1, 231; he defined Maius as 'der wachstum verleihende.' In the same sense Corssen expressed himself (*ib.* 3, 278; 11, 327). Grassmann (*ib.* 16, 171) compared the Tusculan Jupiter *Māius* with Indra *Maghávan*. See also Ascoli *ib.* 17, 274.

[2] Cf. Aen. ix. 706: phalarica—*fulminis acta* modo; x. 38 actam nubibus Irim.

[3] I add here another example of this interchange; noting that ἅμαξα 'wain' means in Hesiod 'plough-carriage' we can connect ὄφατα· δεσμοὶ ἀρότρων 'plough-frame' ὀφνίς· ἄροτρον 'ploughshare' 'Hesychius' with ὄχος 'cart': √*vcĝh-* 'move along.' I shall have to discuss this question in an article on *cortex : cortina*.

[4] Cf. also Festus s.v. *Manuos*: in carminibus saecularibus [*i.e.* saliaribus] Aelius Stilo significare ait bonos. Et inferi di Manes pro boni dicuntur a suppliciter eos venerantibus propter metum mortis, ut immanes quoque pro valde [non bonis] dicuntur.

'pander': λαγνός 'salacious.' For the signification of *mānus* I note the title of Jupiter *optimus maximus*, and the adjective *magnanimus*, comparing also, for the signification, *ā-μείνων* 'better': *μένος* 'might.'[1] Schwenk also compared *μάκαρες θεοί* with *di manes*. Of course if *mānes* comes from **magnes* this last may come from **macnes*. There is no difficulty in operating in all these cases with a suffix *-sno, -sni* as Brugmann does (*Gr.* ii. § 60, 94). Let him who will believe that the Aryans had words in *maĝ-* (*e.g.* μακ-ρός 'long,' Avest. *masita* 'big, tall'), in *maĝ-* (Lat. *magnus*, Grk. *μέγας* 'great'), and in *maĝh-* (Sk. *mahánt* 'great,' Avest. *mazišta-* 'greatest') without isolating for them a common root. To this common root, which we may designate by **mag^{x}-*, *μάκαρες* 'the blessed dead,' *Mānes* (<**magsnes*) and Sk. *Maghā* 'month sacred to the Manes' may be referred. In this sense Ascoli also expressed himself (*l.c.* 274).

§ 2. For *mānus* a derivation from **mag-snu-* suits phonetics and signification well. Paulus (*Epit. Festi* s.v. *matrem matutam*) writes: 'in carmine saliari *cerus manus* intelligitur creator bonus.' Now if *manus* be not the positive of *immānis* it may be after all *mānus* (<**mənu-*) and capable of connection with *ā-μείνων*. Further *mānus* may come from **mad-snu*, and be cognate with Sk. *mand-in* 'joyous' and its kin; or it may come from **mat-snu* and be cognate with Ir. *maith*[2] 'good.' Still another possibility is that in *cerus Mānus* we have the divinity corresponding to the German *Mannus* (Tac. *Germ.* 2), and to the Vedic *Manu*, the primitive ancestor. In this last case *cerus* is possibly an epithet = Umbr. çerfe (cf. Bücheler, *Umbr.* pp. 80, 98), and *Manus* the name.

§ 3. Touching the root *mag^{x}-* I have already noted that its final consonant shifts from 'velar' to 'palatal' (supra I. § 4). Its shift *k- g- gh* was due to consonantal combinations. Thus Sk. *mahás-* is entitled to a gen. **mak-ṣ-ás* (cf. Brugmann *Gr.* ii. § 132); I note *mak-s-ú* 'schnell': *mah-án-* 'schnelle' (cf. Grassman, *Wört.* s.v. 7), and *mahā-padá* 'grosse schritte machend' *i.e.* 'swift.' For the variation of *g* and *gh* I note the neighbourhood of nasals, and refer to Noreen (*l.c.* § 51).[3] In writing the root-vowel as *ă* I follow *μακ-ρός*, and *mag-nus*, not *μέγ-ας*,[4] Goth. *mik-ils*. But, in favour of the reigning vocalic theories the stem may be written *meg^{x}-* with a byform *məg^{x}-*.

IV.—Latin *mās* 'Male,' *Mars*, 'God of War.'

§ 1. A. Weber (*K.Z.* 5, 234) compared *mās* with Sk. *māṅsa* 'flesh'; Benfey *Wurzelerw.* ii. 36 connected with √*man* 'think,' and *manu* 'man'; Leo Meyer (*K.Z.* 5, 387) rejects Benfey's explanation in favour of a problematic √*mṛṣ* 'benetzen,' comparing *ἄρσην* 'male' (Sk. *vṛṣan* : √*vṛṣ* 'benetzen'). Froehde (*B.B.* 7, 126) compares Sk. *majján* 'marrow.'

§ 2. For my part I believe that Benfey's comparison is correct in fact. We have to reckon with the interchange of *s* and *n* stems with *r* stems. I cite the following examples *ὕδωρ*, gen. *ὕδα-τος* (*α<n̥*), dat. *ὕδεϊ* (**ὑδεσι*) 'water'; *οὖθαρ-*, gen. *οὔθα-τος*, Sk. *údhas* 'udder'; *μῆχαρ, μῆχος* 'length,' Sk. *mahán* 'greatness'; Lat. gen. *femor-is*, nom. *femus*, gen. *feminis* 'thigh'; *iecur, iecus-culum*, gen. *ἧπα-τος* 'liver'; *maius, μεῖζον* 'greater,' and other comparative suffixes; *fulgor, fulgus, fulmen* (*mn<g^{w}n*) 'lightning.' These examples may be greatly multiplied (cf. Joh. Schmidt, *K.Z.* 26, 408, and Pedersen, *ib.* 32, 252). I find the same variation in the word for 'man': 1° *mar-* cf. Sk. *már-ya* 'young man,' *μεῖρ-αξ*; 2° *mas-* Lat. (gen.) *mar-is, mas-culus* 'male'; 3° *man-* Sk. *mán-u, mán-us-* in gradation, perhaps, with *ἀν-ήρ* (<**mn-ερ*, a syncretic stem?), and with Sk. *nár-* (<**mn-er*?). In O.Blg. *mąžĭ* I see **mąsi*, that is a contamination of the *n* and *s* stems.[5]

[1] For another less probable etymology of *ἀμείνων* from **n̥+gwen* see *Proc. Am. Phil. Assoc.* Dec. 1895, p. liii.

[2] Stokes (*Fick, Wört.*[4] ii. 199) writes pre-Celtic *mati-s, matos* on the basis of Gallic *Mati-donnus, Teuto-matos*: otherwise the Irish form might be referred to **mad-*. Bezzenberger adds '*ματίς· μέγας. τινὲς ἐπὶ τοῦ βασιλέως* Hesych?' I would correct Hesychius to *ματίς* (cf. *μάντις* 'seer') *μάγος* etc. Further glosses are *ματὴρ· ἐπίσκοπος, ἐπιζητῶν, ἐρευνητής*. This *ματήρ* has been corrected to *μαστήρ*, but its genuineness seems to be attested by *ματία· μαρτυρία*, for as *μαρτυρίαι* is glossed by *βουλήσεις* 'meaning, signification' we may define *ματήρ* and *ματίς* by 'interpreter.' Note also *ματίσαι· ματεῦσαι, ζητῆσαι* 'search.'

[3] I am not myself convinced that *gh* is prior to *g*; *gh* may have been developed from an intervocalic *g* at the end of a syllable plus a 'glottal buzz' before the next vowel; cf. Vietor, *Germ. Pronunc.*[2] p. 57 and the author, *Am. Jr. Phil.* xvi. 23.

[4] I cannot see why *μόγος* 'toil' *μογερός* 'toilsome' should not be brought into this group. No authority is to be given to the *σ-* of the gloss of Hesychius: *σμογερὸν· σκληρὸν. ἐπίβουλον, μοχθηρόν* because of his *σμυγερὸν· ἐπίπονον—μοχθηρὸν—ἐπίβουλον* etc. For the signification I note that Cicero not only says *magnum opus et arduum*, but also *magnum est efficere* etc.; cf. *Od. γ.* 261 *μέγα ἔργον*.

[5] Have we not this treatment of initial *mn°* in the words for 'name'?—*ὄνομα* <**m̥νο-μα* [with *ŏ* for *ă* by

§ 3. We come now to discuss the relation of *mās* and *Mars*. Cicero (*Nat. De.* ii. 67) writes: iam qui magna verteret, Mavors; Varro (*L.L.* p. 18, Steph.) writes: *Mars* ab eo quod maribus in bello praeest. These definitions are combined by Pott (*K.Z.* 26, 205) who interprets by 'Mares vertens.' Corssen (*K.Z.* 2, 1) derives from *mas-t-*. L. Meyer (*K.Z.* 5, 387) compares Sk. *marút-* 'storm-wind.' In *Proc. Am. Phil. Assoc.* July, 1894, p. vii. I referred Mars along with Indra and Ares to the stem *ner* 'man,' with a weak stage *nr̥-* or *n̥r-*, explaining Mars for *Nars (observe the name of Neriene, his wife, and compare with Sk. *indrāṇī*) as due to popular etymology with *mors* 'death.' Subsequently (*ib.* 1895, p. lxviii.) I made a comparison of Mars with Sk. *marút*, independently of L. Meyer's. Now, however, noting Homer's *μέροπες βροτοί* (B, 285) beside *βροτὸς ἀνήρ* (E, 361) I would compare Mars directly with *μέροπες*, in so far as a stem *mer-* 'man' is concerned. It is probable in my opinion that Aryan **mn-er-* a contaminated form of **man-* and **mar-* gave rise to **ner-* beside **mar*. Thus the Aryan prototype of Mars and Indra may have had a double name *Mar-* or *Nar-*. Jacobi (*K.Z.* 31, 316) also makes *indra* a cognate of **ner-* 'man' <**ənro-*. His *ə-* amounts after all to a 'prothetic' vowel; I would write instead **n̥n-ro*, for which a Sk. **andra-* would be expected, and in Avestan we have *andra* beside *indra* in the manuscripts. I have suggested (*l.c.*) that the initial vowel of *indra* was due to alliteration with the god's frequent epithet *iná* 'on-rushing.' If however we may operate with *ən* instead of *n̥*, then *indra* will be beautifully regular from **ənn-ro*, assuming always, with Jacobi, a parasitic *d*.[1]

§ 4. No one ought to feel a difficulty about the *t* of the Latin stem *mar-t-*. It will belong with the *-t-* of Sk. *yakṛ-t-*, Gk. (gen.) *ἦπα-τ-ος*, as well as with the *-t-* of Sk. *Marút*.[2] That the Maruts were the 'manly ones' seems to be clear from the use of *náras* (nom.) and *naras* (voc.) with *Marútas* and *Marutas* twenty-three and eighteen times respectively. It seems to me we shall not go amiss therefore in connecting the *u* of Lat. *Mauors* with the *u* of *Marút*. I assume a stem **maru-* like Sk. *manu* whence **Marv-ars* by contamination with *Mars*. The historic form *Mavors* has *vo* for *va* just as Plautus has *vocivus* for *vacivus* etc. (cf. Lindsay, *Latin Language*, pp. 15, 18), and has been simplified from **Marvors* like *Mamers*, beside *Marmar*.

§ 5. It may not be objected to this identification of Mars with Indra that Mars is an agricultural god of the spring, for such a nature has Indra also who 'divided the brooks according to their order, and in the field the plants bearing flowers and those with fruits; relying on him, the farmer puts his hand to the sickle' (Kaegi, *The Rigveda*, translated by Arrowsmith, p. 45). For the agricultural character of Indra I further cite Pāraskara's *Gṛhya Sūtra* ii. 13, 1: 'On an auspicious day the harnessing to the plough. Or under (the Nakṣatra) Jyeṣṭhā (because that rite is) sacred to Indra' (Oldenberg's translation).

EDWIN W. FAY.

Lexington, Va.

assimilation to the following *o*, cf. Joh. Schmidt, *K.Z.* 32, 370; this assimilation seems to occur only with unaccented *ἀ-*, say from gen. *ὀνόματος*], and *nō-men* <**mnomen*: √men think; at any rate O. Pruss, *emmens* may be interpreted as *m̥n-mn̥-*, *m̥n-* being the weakest grade of *mnō-*. This explanation will absolve the forms without resorting, as Bartholomae does, to six grades (*B.B.* 17, 132). If Cymric *enw* and Armen. *anun* allow us to operate with a stem in *-ven-* beside *-men*, then *ἀν-ώνυμος* 'nameless' may be dissimilated from **αν-ών-υν-ος*; *ω* is in any case such a lengthening as we see in *σοφώτερος* (cf. infra. vii. § 14). I should myself however take *-υμος* for *-υνος*, cf. *νώνυμνος* alternating with *νώνυμος* 'nameless' *υ* being an anaptyptic vowel as in *γυνή*.

[1] As to Bezzenberger's comparison of OHG. *entise, andise* 'antiquus' O. E. *ent* 'giant' <**anta* (*B.B.* 1, 342), I can but believe he is operating with a loan-word, *antiquus*. The connection of ideas is vouched for by the Biblical phrase: 'There were giants in those days'—the days of yore; cf. Leo (*Gloss.* p. 472) who says of O.E. *ent*: 'hat aber zugleich den anspielenden Begriff des alten: *enta geweorc* ein Werk der Riesen sc. der Vorzeit, der Urzeit.' Our word *antic* shows cognate meanings.

[2] The *-t-* of Sk. *mṛtá*, *βροτός* and of Sk. *martya* 'mortal' must also be noted. There is doubtless ultimate kinship between *βροτός* and *ἀνήρ*, the relation being probably that of 'slain' and 'slayer.'

(To be continued.)

CONJECTURES IN THE TEXT OF THE *COMICI GRAECI*.

(1) Χιώνδης ἐν Πτωχοῖς Kock i. p. 5.

'ἐπὶ τῷ ταρίχει τῷδε τοίνυν κόπτετον.'

Read τῷδ' ἔτ' οἶνον. For the use of wine in cooking τάριχος see Alexis K. ii. 366.

(2) Ἐκφαντίδης K. i. p. 9. Aspasius Arist. *Eth. Nicom.* 4, 2 ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἐκφαντίδης παλαιότατος τῶν ἀρχαίων ποιητής φησι· Μεγαρικῆς κωμῳδίας ᾆσμα δίειμαι αἰσχύνομαι τὸ δρᾶμα Μεγαρικὸν ποιεῖν, with the variants δίειμ' ἠσχυνόμην and ᾠδὴν παρέρχομαι ὤκνη ποίημα Μεγαρικὸν ποιῆσαι. The metre is iambic dimeter, as Meineke divined, and the variants are adscripts, thus :—

<μὴ> Μεγαρίσης, Κωμῳδία,
<ἐ>ς ᾆσμα δὲ εἶμι· ἠσχυνόμην
τὸ δρᾶμα <ἂν> Μεγαρικὸν ποιεῖν.

Notes adscript :—ᾆσμα : ᾠδήν.
εἶμι : παρέρχομαι.
ἠσχυνόμην : ὤκνησα· γράφεται καὶ αἰσχύνομαι.
δρᾶμα : ποίημα.

(3) Κρατῖνος ἐν Ἀρχιλόχοις K. i. p. 11.

'κἀγὼ γὰρ ηὔχουν Μητρόβιος ὁ γραμματεύς
σὺν ἀνδρὶ θείῳ καὶ φιλοξενωτάτῳ
καὶ παντ' ἀρίστῳ τῶν Πανελλήνων πρώτῳ
Κίμωνι λιπαρὸν γῆρας εὐωχούμενος
αἰῶνα πάντα συνδιατρίψειν· ὁ δὲ λιπὼν
βέβηκε πρότερος.'

It would appear that just as κάτω is given in the manuscripts for κἀγὼ (Stephanus) in the first line, so here ἄτῳ, *i.e.* πρώτῳ, is here given in lieu of ἀγῷ. That ἀγός is a poetical or dialectical word elsewhere unknown in Attic prose or comedy is an argument fatal to this conjecture, unless we suppose that Cratinus here designates Cimon by some title given him by the Πανελλήνων στρατός.

(4) Κρατῖνος ἐν Ἀρχιλόχοις K. i. p. 14.

ὠμολίνοις κόμῃ βρύουσ' ἀτιμίας πλέῳς.

Read in 'metrum Cratineum'—

ὠμολίνοις κόμην ἀβρύνουσ' ἀτιμίας πλέῳς.

That ὠμόλινα means a kerchief here is made probable by the context in *Athenaeus* 9, 410 d. where the line is quoted.

(5) Κρατῖνος ἐν Βουκόλοις K. i. p. 18.

Hesychius ΠΥΡΠΕΡΕΓΧΕΙ· Κρατῖνος ἀπὸ διθυράμβου ἐν Βουκόλοις ἀρξάμενος, ἐπειδὴ χορὸν οὐκ ἔλαβε περὶ τοῦ ἄρχοντος ἔστιν οὗ ἠτήρει.

Read πῦρ πῦρ ἔγχει with Casaubon, and correct ἀρξάμενος into ἀρ<πα>ξάμενος and ἔστιν οὗ ἠτήρει into εἴς τιν' ᾧ ἠταίρει, 'an expression from a dithyramb which Cratinus violently transferred to the "Herdsmen," when he had been refused a chorus. The allusion is to the archon's criminal relations with another man.'

(6) Κρατῖνος ἐν Δηλιάσιν K. i. p. 19.

Ὑπερβορέους αἴθρεια τιμῶντας στέφη.

Read αἴθρει' ἀγινοῦντας στέφη. In Hdt. 4, 33, Bekk. *Anecd.* 355, Suidas s.v. στεφάνωσις the word used is κομίζειν. Apparently in Cratinus the speaker is an Ionian who uses the Ionic equivalent for κομίζειν.

(7) Κρατῖνος ἐν Δηλιάσιν K. i. p. 20.

ἔρραζε πρὸς τὴν γῆν, ὁ δ' ἠσκάριζε κἀπέπαρδε.

The words πρὸς τὴν γῆν have no business here. They are adscript to a reading ἔραζε.

(8) Κρατῖνος ἐν Διονυσαλεξάνδρῳ· K i. p. 24.

στολὴν δὲ δὴ τίν' εἰχετονδομοιφρασον.

Read στολὴν δὲ δὴ τίν' εἶχ'; ἔτ' οὐδ' ὅ μοι φράσων; 'Is there still no one to tell me?'

(9) Κρατῖνος ἐν Δραπέτισιν K. i. p. 27.

τὸν Κερκυόνα θ' εὥθεν ἀποπατοῦντ' ἐπὶ τοῖς λαχάνοις εὑρὼν ἀπέπνιξα.

Read τὸν Κερκυόνα τέως ἐναποπατοῦντα τοῖς Λάκωσιν εὑρὼν ἀπέπνιξα. The ἐπί was inserted when the ἐν got attached to the τέως. For Λάκωνες corrupted to some part of λάχανον cp. Scholia to Arist. *Lys.* 983, 1248. Cercyones is an apt nickname for Pericles as breaking into the Athenian treasury to provide the δικαστικόν, etc. See Scholia to Arist. *Nub.* 508.

(10) Κρατῖνος ἐν Δραπέτισιν K. i. p. 30.

Λάμπωνα τὸν οὐ βροτῶν
ψῆφος δύναται φλεγυρὰ δείπνου φίλων ἀπείργειν.

νῦν δ' αὖθις ἐρυγγάνει·
βρύκει γὰρ ἅπαν τὸ παρόν, τρίγλῃ δὲ κἂν μάχοιτο.

Read Λάμπωνα θ' ὃν οὐ *βροτῶν*, 'quem mortalium non.' The *ψῆφος φλεγυρά* would seem to be a pebble made very hot and given to Lampon in lieu of an olive. Perhaps *τρίγλῃ* is a corruption of Τρίκκῃ, *i.e.* 'the Faculty.'

(11) Κρατῖνος ἐν Μαλακοῖς K i. p. 43.

τίς ἄρ' ἐρῶντά μ' οἶδεν, ὦ Γνήσιππ' ; ἐγὼ πολλῇ
χολῇ·
οἶομαι γὰρ μηδὲν οὕτως μωρὸν εἶναι καὶ κενόν.

Read *ἐρῶ πολλῇ σχολῇ*.

(12) Κρατῖνος ἐν Νόμοις K i. p. 52.

χρυσίδι σπένδων γέγραφε τοῖς ὄφεσι πιεῖν διδούς.

Read

χρυσίδι
σπένδων, ἀναγραφεῦ, τοῖς ὄφεσι πιεῖν δίδου.

Apparently the Registrar, fearing that his occupation is likely to die, has gone to the temple of Aesculapius to pray for its restoration to health.

W. G. Rutherford.

THE MINOR WORKS OF XENOPHON.

(Continued from Vol. X. p. 294.)

III. The Hiero.

Holden's edition of the *Hiero* (1883) is careful and serviceable like his edition of the *Oeconomicus*. I have not seen anything of later date, except Hartman's *Analecta*.

1, 1. *καὶ ποῖα ταῦτ' ἐστίν, ἔφη ὁ Ἱέρων, ὁποῖα δὴ ἐγὼ βέλτιον ἂν εἰδείην σοῦ οὕτως ὄντος σοφοῦ ἀνδρός.*

So the MSS. of this dialogue, while Stobaeus has *ὁποῖα ἐγώ*. Cobet reads *ὁποῖ' ἂν ἐγὼ βέλτιον εἰδείην*, proceeding on the common confusion of *ἄν* and *δή*. But *ὁποῖα* after *ποῖα* seems awkward and I suggest doubtfully *ποῖα ταῦτ' ἐστίν ; ἔφη ὁ Ἱέρων· ποῖα δὴ ἐγὼ βέλτιον ἂν εἰδείην κ.τ.λ.* A corruption of *ποῖα* to *ὁποῖα* may seem unlikely, but *ὁποίαν* appears for *ποίαν* in Eur. *Bacch.* 663.

1, 4. We need a participle to govern *τὰ ἀφροδίσια*, unless indeed we should read *τοῖς ἀφροδισίοις*, and the context shows that its general meaning must be not 'doing' but 'enjoying' or 'feeling.' It was therefore some such word as *αἰσθανομένους* or *πάσχοντας*. It seems to have been lost before Stobaeus quoted the passage.

1, 14. *εἰ τοῖς θεάμασι μειονεκτεῖτε.*

Cobet reads *εἰ ἐν τοῖς θ.* with Stobaeus, no doubt rightly. Cf. 11 *ἐν τοῖς...θεάμασι... εὑρίσκω μειονεκτοῦντας*: 27 *ἐν ᾧ σαφέστατα μειονεκτοῦμεν*: 29: 2, 2. But for the same reason we must read in 19 *ὥστε κἀν* (not *καί*) *τῷ χρόνῳ τὴς ἡδονῆς μειονεκτεῖ*. (Athenaeus 144 E quotes it with *καί*.) In 18 on the other hand, *ὥστε ταύτῃ πρῶτον τῇ εὐφροσύνῃ τῆς ἐλπίδος μειονεκτοῦσι τῶν ἰδιωτῶν*, it seems unnecessary to add *ἐν*. The principle is this. When the dative expresses that *in respect of which*, the sort of thing *in which*, one person is at an advantage or disadvantage as compared with another, *ἐν* is needed. Where the dative expresses the thing or amount *by which*, that is to say, is an ordinary dative of measurement, *ἐν* is not used. Now the pleasure of hope in 18 is not a thing of which, *or in respect of which*, the tyrant has less than private men, for of this particular kind of hope he has none at all. They are better off than he is *by* this hope, *i.e.* by the whole amount of it which they have, for there is none on his part to be subtracted when the balance is struck. He is worsted *in* some things and *by* (the whole of) others.

1, 15. *καὶ τί οἴει ἔφη, τοὺς μὴ λέγοντας κακῶς εὐφραίνειν, ὅταν εἰδῇ τις σαφῶς ὅτι οἱ σιωπῶντες οὗτοι πάντες κακόνοι εἰσι τῷ τυράννῳ ;*

Is *τῷ τυράννῳ* an adscript? It seems awkward, considering that *τις* in *εἰδῇ τις* is the tyrant himself. Cf. the omissions suggested below in 2, 15 and 6, 1.

1, 23. *Ἄλλο τι οὖν οἴει, ἔφη ὁ Ἱέρων, ταῦτα τὰ ἐδέσματα εἶναι ἢ μαλακῆς καὶ ἀσθενούσης τρυφῇ ψυχῆς ἐπιθυμήματα.*

Holden follows Cobet in omitting *τά*, so as to make *ἐδέσματα* a predicate. But this is clearly wrong, for, taking it that way and making *ἄλλο τι οἴει* 'don't you think?', we can make no sense of what follows without understanding *ἤ* as = *μάλλον ἤ*, which is unwarrantable. Nor does Xenophon appear ever to use the Platonic interrogative *ἄλλο τι* not in connection with an *ἤ*. The obvious meaning is the right

one: 'do you think they are anything else than' etc. Hartman is probably right in changing *ἐπιθυμήματα* to *ἐνθυμήματα*, 'devices,' a word which Xenophon uses several times and which is certainly supported here by *σοφίσματα* immediately following and *μηχανήματα* preceding.

1, 27. *πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ γάμος ὁ μὲν ἐκ μειζόνων...κάλλιστος δοκεῖ εἶναι...δεύτερον δ' ὁ ἐκ τῶν ὁμοίων· ὁ δ' ἐκ τῶν φαυλοτέρων πάνυ ἄτιμός τε καὶ ἄχρηστος νομίζεται.*

δεύτερον should be *δεύτερος*. The word does not really correspond to *πρῶτον μὲν*, as some copyist fancied, but to *κάλλιστος* and *πάνυ ἄτιμος*. If we read *δεύτερον*, we have no predicate.

1, 28. *τῷ τοίνυν τυράννῳ, ἂν μὴ ξένην γήμῃ, ἀνάγκη ἐκ μειόνων γαμεῖν.*

Read *γαμῇ* for *γήμῃ*, for there is no sense in saying 'unless he *has* married a foreign woman.' It is perhaps not sufficiently understood that an aorist subjunctive following a conjunction or a relative pronoun (*ὃς ἂν γήμῃ*, etc.) invariably has this sense of an action completed. Goodwin (M. and T. § 90) hardly states the rule strongly enough, and among other things his readers might suppose that it held good with *ἐπειδάν*, but not with *ὅταν*. I believe there is no word or case of any kind to which it does not apply. The obvious sense here is 'he must marry beneath him, unless he marries a foreigner,' and this requires *γαμῇ*. For a like reason it is plain that in Plat. *Phaedr.* 256 E *ὁμοπτέρους ἔρωτος χάριν ὅταν γένωνται γίγνεσθαι* we should read *ὅταν γίγνωνται*.

1, 38. *ᾗ μαλιστ' ἂν δύνωνται* should be *ᾗ ἂν μάλιστα δύνωνται*. *Ἄν* cannot in an ordinary way be separated from its relative by anything but a small particle, *e.g. μέν* or *γάρ*. *Frogs* 259 does not authorise such a use in prose.

2, 3. *ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν πλῆθος τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὦ Σιμωνίδη, ἐξαπατᾶσθαι ὑπὸ τῆς τυραννίδος οὐδέν τι θαυμάζω· μάλα γὰρ ὁ ὄχλος μοι δοκεῖ δοξάζειν ὁρῶν καὶ εὐδαίμονάς τινας εἶναι καὶ ἀθλίους.*

Read *τὸ μὲν <τὸ> πλῆθος*. So in 5 *τὸ μὲν οὖν τὸ πλῆθος περὶ τούτου λεληθέναι...οὐ θαυμάζω*: and cf. 8, 1. Both articles are needed. There is an error here in the use of *μάλα*, which it is not difficult to correct. As the Greek stands, it must be joined either with *δοκεῖ* or *δοξάζειν*. *μάλα* is but seldom joined to a verb, as comparatively few verbs contain a suitable idea, and is not always really joined to it even when it stands next to it. Thus in *Cyrop.* 6, 1, 36; *καὶ μάλα δοκοῦντες φρονίμους εἶναι*, Liddell and Scott are wrong in joining *μάλα* with *δοκοῦντας*: it goes with *φρονίμους*. *μάλα, πάνυ*, etc. are constantly separated from the words they qualify. With *δοκεῖ* or *δοξάζειν* *μάλα* might be joined, but it makes here very indifferent sense. The strength of the belief is nothing to the point. I conjecture that some such adverb as *εὐηθῶς* should be inserted in the sentence, probably, but not necessarily, after *μάλα γάρ*; that will restore meaning to the words. Hiero says 'I am not surprised at the mass of men being imposed upon by tyranny, for the common people seem to me to judge of men's condition very foolishly by externals only' (*ὁρῶν*).

In the next §, where he goes on, 'what does surprise me is that the same mistake should be made by men like yourself, who are supposed to use your judgments and not merely your eyes (*ὑμᾶς...οἳ διὰ τῆς γνώμης θεᾶσθαι δοκεῖτε κάλλιον ἢ διὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν τὰ πράγματα*), for *κάλλιον* read *μᾶλλον*.

2, 7. *εἰ ἡ μὲν εἰρήνη δοκεῖ μέγα ἀγαθόν..., ταύτης ἐλάχιστον τοῖς τυράννοις μέτεστιν· ὁ δὲ πόλεμος μέγα κακόν, τοῦτου πλεῖστον μέρος οἱ τύραννοι μετέχουσιν.* Cobet *εἰ δὲ πόλεμος* with Stobaeus. Perhaps *ὁ δὲ πόλεμος εἰ μέγα κακόν*. I suspect the first words are not right either, but should run either *εἰ μὲν ἡ εἰρήνη* or *ἡ μὲν εἰρήνη εἰ*. If Cobet is right, then read *εἰ μὲν εἰρήνη*, omitting *ἡ*.

2, 12–14. Dr. Holden is, I think, wrong in taking *ὁ* (*οἱ*) *ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι* to mean 'citizens.' *ὁ* (the singular) *ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι* would be an extraordinary expression, and the antithesis to *τύραννος* hardly necessitates this way of understanding it. We have to understand *πόλεμος* and *πόλεμοι*. *τούτων τῶν πολέμων* in § 12 has on Dr. Holden's theory no construction at all.

2, 15. The second *τούς πολεμίους* should be omitted. Cf. on 1, 15.

4, 3. *πολῖται γὰρ δοροφοροῦσι κ.τ.λ.*

Read *<οἱ> πολῖται* with Stobaeus. *οἱ* has been absorbed in the last letters of *ἄξιαι* preceding.

4, 11. *οἱ τύραννοι τοίνυν ἀναγκάζονται πλεῖστα συλᾶν ἀδίκως καὶ ἱερὰ καὶ ἀνθρώπους διὰ τὸ...προσδεῖσθαι χρημάτων.*

Read *<τὰ> πλεῖστα*. *τά* has been absorbed in a similar way. At least this seems to me more probable than that *πλεῖστα* agrees with *ἱερά*.

6, 2. *ἐγὼ γὰρ συνῆν ἡλικιώταις ἡδόμενος ἡδομένοις ἐμοί.*

ἐμοί is an adscript and should be expelled from the text, unless we think *ἐρῶν ἐρῶσαν ἐμοῦ, ἑκὼν ἑκοῦσαν αὐτήν*, or *ἀπὼν ἀπόντα ἀπ'*

αὐτοῦ would be endurable. ἀπεστέρημαι μὲν τῶν ἡδομένων ἐμοί in 3 is another matter.

6, 10. ὥστε περὶ ἑαυτῶν φοβοῦνται καὶ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν.

Probably <καὶ> ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῶν.

6, 16. καὶ τἆλλα γε κτήματα, ὅσα χαλεπὰ μὲν χρήσιμα δ' ἐστίν, ὁμοίως ἅπαντα λυπεῖ μὲν τοὺς κεκτημένους, λυπεῖ δὲ ἀπαλλαττομένους.

There is evidently something faulty in the last words, but Cobet's change of ἀπαλλαττομένους to ἀπαλλαττόμενα seems hardly an improvement, leaving as it does a very unsymmetrical sentence. Perhaps the illustration Hiero has just given may help us to see what we want. He has taken his illustration from a horse—εἰ ἀγαθὸς μὲν εἴη, φοβερὸς δὲ μὴ ἀνήκεστόν τι ποιήσῃ, χαλεπῶς μὲν ἄν τις αὐτὸν ἀποκτείνειε (ἀποκτείναι MSS.) διὰ τὴν ἀρετήν, χαλεπῶς δὲ ζῶντι χρῷτο, εὐλαβούμενος μή τι ἀνήκεστον ἐν τοῖς κινδύνοις ἐργάσηται. His owner, that is to say, would not like to kill him and would not like to use him. Then, generalising the matter, Hiero goes on: καὶ τἆλλα γε κτήματα ...ὁμοίως ἅπαντα λυπεῖ μὲν <χρωμένους> τοὺς κεκτημένους, λυπεῖ δὲ ἀπαλλαττομένους. The turn is like that of Lucan ix. 200 *iuvit sumpta ducem, iuvit dimissa potestas.* The same meaning might be got, but I think less well, by simply omitting τούς.

7, 11. οὔτε ἄλλος μὲν δὴ οὐδεὶς πώποτε ἑκὼν εἶναι τυραννίδος ἀφεῖτο, ὅσπερ ἅπαξ ἐκτήσατο.

ὅσπερ is quite out of place here. Read ὅστις. So in the *Knights* 1385:—

> ἔχε νυν ἐπὶ τούτοις τουτονί τὸν ὀκλαδίαν
> καὶ παῖδ' ἐνόρχην, ὅσπερ οἴσει τόνδε σοι,

ὅσπερ should, so far as I can see, be ὅστις. ὅστις with the future = *qui* with the subjunctive (final) in Latin: there is no such use of ὅσπερ and its regular meaning is unsuitable here.

8, 5. ἀλλ' ἔμοιγε δοκεῖ καὶ ἐκ θεῶν τιμή τις καὶ χάρις συμπαρέπεσθαι ἀνδρὶ ἄρχοντι· μὴ γὰρ ὅτι καλλίονα ποιεῖ ἄνδρα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν τοῦτον καλλίω θεώμεθά τε ὅταν ἄρχῃ ἢ ὅταν ἰδιωτεύῃ κ.τ.λ.

The sense here is imperfectly expressed, unless we read καλλίονα ποιεῖ ἄνδρα <ἀνδρός>.

8, 9. καὶ ὅταν γε τάχους καιρὸς παραστῇ ἢ πεζῇ ἢ κατὰ θάλατταν ἐξορμᾶσθαι, οὐκ ἐπιτρεπτέον τοῖς ῥᾳδιουργοῦσιν.

Probably we should read <διὰ> τάχους, to be taken of course with ἐξορμᾶσθαι. Sturz however does not give any instance of διὰ τάχους in Xenophon. Possibly ταχέως.

9, 7. ἐπιδοίη should be ἐπιδιδοίη. All the parallel verbs are presents.

11, 7. ἀλλ' ἐγω σοί φημι, ὦ Ἱέρων, πρὸς ἄλλους προστάτας πόλεων τὸν ἀγῶνα εἶναι, ὧν ἐὰν σὺ εὐδαιμονεστάτην τὴν πόλιν ἧς προστατεύεις παρέχῃς, εὖ ἔσει νικῶν καλλίστῳ καὶ μεγαλοπρεπεστάτῳ τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἀγωνίσματι.

For εὖ ἔσει Canter's εὖ ἴσθι is often adopted. Cobet however condemns the alteration, saying 'requiritur in apodosi futurum et ἔσει sanum est; ευ videtur ex lacuna superesse pro εὐδαίμων ἔσει, εὐκλεέστατος ἔσει aut simile quid' (*sic*). I think both ἔσει and ἴσθι are probably right and would read εὖ ἴσθι ἔσει ὁ νικῶν or ἔσει εὖ ἴσθι ὁ νικῶν. The future is certainly necessary (cf. *Ages.* 9, 7) and Canter should at least have read εὖ ἴσθι νικήσων. εὖ ἴσθι occurs in the last sentence of the book: κἂν ταῦτα πάντα ποιῇς, εὖ ἴσθι πάντων τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις κάλλιστον καὶ μακαριώτατον κτῆμα κεκτήσει, where the words favour, I think, my reading here. Cf. also 7, 10. ἔσει νικῶν seems a doubtful expression: I would read ὁ νικῶν, and make the construction ὧν...ἔσει ὁ νικῶν. Cf. *Apol. Socr.* 29 ὁπότερος ἡμῶν καὶ συμφορώτερα καὶ καλλίω εἰς τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον διαπέπρακται, οὗτός ἐστι καὶ ὁ νικῶν. In Eur. *Bacch.* 975 ὁ νικήσων δ' ἐγὼ καὶ Βρόμιος ἔσται Wecklein must, I think, be right in reading ἐστι. Either word may be future, but not both.

11, 12. οὐ συμμάχους μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ προμάχους καὶ προθύμους ὁρῴης ἄν. Read καὶ <τούτους> προθύμους. The adjective προθύμους cannot be coupled with the substantive προμάχους. Of course the first καί is not parallel to the second, but looks back to οὐ μόνον. The point of καὶ <τούτους> προθύμους is given in 6, 11. Heindorf and Cobet omit the second καί, and possibly that is better than adding τούτους.

IV. The Hipparchicus.

1, 3. ἐπιμελητέον δ' ὅπως εὐχρηστοι ὦσιν (οἱ ἵπποι)· οἱ γὰρ αὖ ἀπειθεῖς τοῖς πολεμίοις μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς φίλοις συμμαχοῦσι.

The *v.l.* εὐπειθεῖς for εὔχρηστοι has much to recommend it, for εὔχρηστοι is too vague a word here. Many things besides docility go to make up εὐχρηστία or serviceableness. Perhaps, however, we might adopt εὔπειστοι, which Xenophon uses below in 9, 3 as a sort of mean between the two words and accounting better for the mistake.

3, 3. δεῖ γὰρ μεταξὺ τοῖν ὤτοιν τοῦ ἵππου ἕκαστον σχεῖν (τὸ δόρυ).

There is no propriety in the aorist here. Read ἔχειν. The two words are often confused.

4, 12. *ἔτι δὲ τῷ μὲν κρυπτὰς ἔχοντι φυλακάς κ.τ.λ.*

I can see nothing in the text or in the writer's mind to justify this *μέν*. In 7, 1 there is another (*ὑπάρχουσι μέν*) which seems, as indeed does the whole sentence, somewhat strange, but perhaps a meaning can be found for it.

5, 8. *ὅταν τοῖς ἐναντίοις πράγματα καὶ ἀσχολίας πυνθάνωνται.*

Cobet would insert *οὔσας* after *ἀσχολίας*, Madvig (*Adv. Crit.* i. p. 360) *ὄντα* after *ὅταν*. *ὄντα* after *πράγματα* would perhaps fall out most easily.

6, 5. *ὅπως ὁρῶσι τὸν ἄρχοντα δυνάμενον... καὶ ἀπ' ὄχθων καταίρειν.*

καταίρειν is used of birds alighting and ships putting into port, but is quite inappropriate for a horseman on a slope. Madvig has made the grotesque suggestion of *καταῤῥεῖν*, as though one man on horseback could be said to stream down a hill. *καταίρειν* can hardly represent anything but *καταβαίνειν* (*καταβαίνειν— καταίνειν — καταίρειν*) or possibly *καταθεῖν*. *κατάγειν* would probably not be used of *riding* down.

7, 4. *καὶ γὰρ φρονήσεως δεῖ πολλῆς πρὸς τοὺς πολὺ πλείους καὶ τόλμης, ὁπότε καιρὸς παραπέσοι.*

ὁπότε with the optative seems strange here after *δεῖ*. Should we not read *εἴ ποτε*?

8, 5. *εἰ δέ τις νομίζει πολλὰ ἔχειν πράγματα, εἰ οὕτω δεήσει ἀσκεῖν τὴν ἱππικήν, κ.τ.λ.*

Cobet reads *πόλλ' <ἄν> ἔχειν*. I should prefer *ἕξειν*. So in 9, 8 *ἐπιβουλεύουσι μὲν ἀλλήλοις οἱ ἐναντίοι, ὀλιγάκις δὲ ἴσασι πῶς ἔχει τὰ ἐπιβουλευόμενα* (where Xenophon is speaking of the uncertainty of the future, as *προσημαίνουσι* shows) we should alter *ἔχει* to *ἕξει*. In the first section of the Περὶ Ἱππικῆς Cobet has himself corrected *ἐξαλείφομεν* to *ἐξαλείψομεν*, and the alteration of future to present is a blunder which copyists have constantly fallen into.

8, 12. *εἰς τὰ τοιαῦτά φημι πολὺ κρεῖττον εἶναι ὀλίγους ἢ πάντας προσάγειν, τοὺς μέντοι ἀπειλεγμένους καὶ ἵππους καὶ ἄνδρας τοὺς κρατίστους.*

For *τοὺς μέντοι* we must read *τούτους μέντοι*. The *του* has been accidentally written once instead of twice.

9, 1. *ταῦτα δὲ ἀναγιγνώσκειν μὲν καὶ ὀλιγάκις ἀρκεῖ, ποιεῖν δὲ τὸ παρατυγχάνον ἀεὶ αὐτῷ δεῖ.*

The antithesis is not exactly between some things to be read and other things to be done, for in that case we should rather have *καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἀναγιγνώσκειν*, but between reading the precepts and applying them in practice. Perhaps, therefore, we might write *ποιεῖν δὲ <πρὸς> τὸ παρατυγχάνον* (Thuc. i. 122, 2) or *<κατά>*, Madvig proposes to write *ἐννοεῖν* for *ποιεῖν*, but I see no advantage in that.

V. De Re Equestri.

1, 2. *ὥσπερ γὰρ οἰκίας οὐδὲν ὄφελος ἂν εἴη, εἰ τὰ ἄνω πάνυ καλὰ ἔχοι, μὴ ὑποκειμένων οἵων δεῖ θεμελίων, οὕτω καὶ ἵππου πολεμιστηρίου οὐδὲν ἂν ὄφελος εἴη, οὐδ' εἰ τἆλλα πάντα ἀγαθὰ ἔχοι, κακόνους δ' εἴη.*

Cobet, objecting not without reason to the latter part of this, suggests *οὐδὲν ἂν ὄφελος εἴη, εἰ τἆλλα μὲν πάντα ἀγαθὰ ἔχοι, κακόνους δ' εἴη*. I would add to this that the *οὐδέ* thus ousted belongs to the earlier part of the sentence, which is imperfect without it; *<οὐδ'> εἰ τὰ ἄνω πάνυ καλὰ ἔχοι.*

1, 3. *πότερον αἱ ὁπλαί εἰσιν ὑψηλαὶ [ἢ ταπειναὶ] καὶ ἔμπροσθεν καὶ ὄπισθεν ἢ χαμηλαί ...αἱ δὲ ταπειναί κ.τ.λ.*

So Dindorf, recognising that *ταπειναί* is a gloss on *χαμηλαί*. Then we ought also to read *αἱ δὲ χαμηλαί*, not *αἱ δὲ ταπειναί*.

1, 17. There are some signs by which you can tell with fair certainty how a young horse will develop: *εἰ δέ τινες αὐξανόμενοι μεταβάλλουσιν, ὅμως οὕτω θαρροῦντες δοκιμάζοιμεν.*

The optative here is a solecism. It may be put right by adding *ἄν*, as in the sentence before, or by reading *δοκιμάζωμεν*, or in other ways. The first seems the most likely to be right.

2, 1. A young man ought *εὐεξίας τε ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τῆς ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ἱππικῆς ἢ ἐπισταμένῳ ἥδη ἱππάζεσθαι μελετᾶν.*

Perhaps for *ἱππικῆς* we should read something like *ἱππικὴν <ἢ μανθάνειν> ἢ*. The alternative in the text points to this. The repeated *ἤ* may have caused the omission.

4, 4. Does not *μέρος* want a *τι*?

5, 10. *οὐ φθάνει τε ἐξαγόμενος ὁ ἵππος καὶ κ.τ.λ.* Dindorf and Sauppe retain the *τε*, which Zeune and Schneider saw to be impossible. The common confusion of *τε* and *γε* seems to have taken place here.

6, 3. *ἐκ πλαγίου δ' ἄν τις προσιὼν ἀβλαβέστατα μὲν ἑαυτῷ, πλεῖστα δ' ἄν ἵππῳ δύναιτο χρῆσθαι.*

When Madvig proposed *λῷστα* for *πλεῖστα*, he forgot that *λώων, λῷστος*, etc. are not used in pure Attic prose nor in Xenophon, except in one or two set phrases, such as *λῷον καὶ ἄμεινον* and *ὦ λῷστε*. *πλεῖστα*, however, does seem wrong, and perhaps we should read *ῥᾷστα*. (Herwerden *κάλλιστα*.) *ἵππῳ* should be *<τῷ> ἵππῳ*.

6, 14. *καὶ ὅταν δὲ ὑποπτεύσας τι ὁ ἵππος μὴ*

ἐθέλῃ πρὸς τοῦτο προσιέναι, διδάσκειν δεῖ ὅτι οὐ δεινά ἐστι, μάλιστα μὲν οὖν ἵππῳ εὐκαρδίῳ· εἰ δὲ μή, ἁπτόμενον αὐτὸν τοῦ δεινοῦ δοκοῦντος εἶναι καὶ τὸν ἵππον πρᾴως προσάγοντα.

Schneider must be right in suggesting *οὐ δεινὸν* for *οὐ δεινά*, unless we are to read *οὐ δεινὰ ἐστὶ <τὰ τοιαῦτα>*: but he is quite wrong about *ἵππῳ εὐκαρδίῳ*. He translates it 'not alarming, especially for a courageous horse,' but supposes the words to be an interpolation and sets about entirely recasting the sentence in a most arbitrary way. *ἵππῳ εὐκαρδίῳ*, if right, is (as Dindorf takes it) an instrumental dative. The rider is to pacify his horse, if possible, by means of another horse, which approaches the object without fear or hesitation: if not that, then by the other means. The dative is like those in Thuc. 1, 25, 4. *Κορινθίῳ ἀνδρὶ προκαταρχόμενοι τῶν ἱερῶν*: Herod. 7, 191, 2 *καταείδοντες γόησι τῷ ἀνέμῳ*: Eur. *Heracl.* 392 *οὐκ ἀγγέλοισι τοὺς ἐναντίους ὁρᾶν*. This is certainly the meaning, but possibly we have lost a word or two.

7, 2. *καὶ μηδὲ* (or *μήτε*) seems wrong. Read *μηδέ* or *καὶ μή*.

8, 1. Add *δέ* after *ἐπειδήπερ*.

10, 15. *ὑπὸ μὲν τοῦ χαλινοῦ πιεσθεὶς, ὑπὸ δὲ τοῦ ὁρμᾶν σημανθῆναι ἐγείρεται.* '*Leunclavius corrigere tentabat scribendo πιέζεται vel πιεσθεὶς λυπεῖται*' Schneider. It is plain, I think, that some verb is omitted after *πιεσθείς*.

12, 6. For *προσθεταί* read *προσθετέαι, αἳ*. We have *ἀφαιρετέον* immediately before and similar or equivalent forms all through the chapter.

H. Richards.

ON SOME PASSAGES OF XENOPHON'S *OECONOMICUS* AND *HELLENICS* II. 3, 31. [*See Vol. X.* p. 381.]

Mr. Platt's *Miscellanea* (*Classical Review*, Nov. 1896, p. 381), deal with several points which interest me considerably. The first is his difficulty about the use of *ἐγώ* for 'anybody.' Mr. Platt thinks it strange that *ἐγώ* does not mark contrast between myself and some one else. This difficulty appears to rest in the first instance upon a double misconception. In the first place the insertion of the personal pronoun ought not to be expected to import such a contrast. In other cases it only marks a stress which English would give differently, *e.g.* *καλῶς σὺ ποιῶν* 'and you were *right*.' Secondly, such a contrast in the present case would be meaningless. What is the contrast to 'Anybody'? 'Nobody,' I presume. There is indeed one situation in which *ἐγώ* can convey a contrast. This is when *I* forms one member of an ideal pair, the other member being *you*. Thus in Plato, *Theaetetus* 175 C in an instructive phrase *ἐκβῆναι ἐκ τοῦ 'τί ἐγὼ σὲ ἀδικῶ ἢ σύ ἐμε,' εἰς σκέψιν αὐτῆς δικαιοσύνης τε καὶ ἀδικίας* and in the first of the passages quoted from the *Respublica Atheniensium* (i. § 11). Elsewhere the presence or absence of emphasis, as hinted above, alone decides where the pronoun is to be inserted or omitted. Emphasis, emphasis distributed through the sentence in English, compels the *ἐγώ* in Demosth. *Philippics* 3, § 17; for Demosthenes' text is that hostile *preparations* are *acts* of hostility, and *ἐγώ...ἐμοί* give, though more skilfully, the effect of the English italics. *Respublica Ath.* ii. §§ 11, 12 is however no example as is seen on full quotation *καὶ ἐγὼ μὲν οὐδὲν πονῶν ἐκ τῆς γῆς πάντα ταῦτα ἔχω διὰ τὴν θάλατταν ἄλλη δὲ οὐδεμία πόλις δύο τούτων ἔχει.* The speaker clearly identifies himself with Athens; and so Belot takes the passage. The explanation of the usage which Mr. Platt quotes '*ἐγὼ* means *anybody, myself for example*,' appears to invert the order of development. The *I* in such cases means 'I, and, since I am typical, *anybody*.' It may be worth adding that outside Greek too both the use of the first person and the insertion of a pronoun have provoked comment. Thus in Lucan 7, 768 one MS. and more than one editor read *putes* for *putem*. And Madvig, *Lat. Gr.* § 370 *obs.* notes the rarity of the insertion of *tu* when this pronoun is indefinite. Ovid, *Met.* 4, 399 has a bearing on the present discussion 'tempusque subibat | quod *tu* nec tenebras nec lucem dicere posses.' The *tu* means 'you *could* not call it night, you *could* not call it light,' or, to change the form of the expression somewhat, '*no one* could call it *either*.'

Xenophon, *Oeconomicus* ii. 15. Mr. Platt appears to be right in reading another *ἡγησάμην* for *ἤγαγον*; but it is unnecessary to suggest that it is 'impossible to account scientifically for the corruption.' *ἤγαγον* is only a marginal explanation of *ἡγησάμην*, nor

is it in the least surprising that it has ousted it.

viii. 2 *ἀλλὰ γὰρ, ἔφην ἐγώ, τούτων οὐ σὺ αἰτία, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ οὐ τάξας σοι παρέδωκα ὅπου χρὴ ἕκαστα κεῖσθαι ὅπως εἰδῇς ὅπου τε δεῖ τιθέναι καὶ ὁπόθεν λαμβάνειν.* I am afraid Mr. Platt has condemned himself to lecture on the *Oeconomicus* a third time. For *εἰδῇς* we should read *ᾖδεις*. This idiom, though undoubtedly rare in Xenophon, is not a *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον* as Weber, *Entwickelungsgeschichte u. Absichtssätze* II. p. 83, followed by Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses* § 333, supposes. For, besides *Anab.* 7, 6, 23, it occurs in *Cyr.* 1, 6, 40 *ἵνα—συνέδει* as Hug rightly reads with the best MSS.

xii. 17 *καὶ τόδε μοι παρατρεπόμενος τοῦ λόγου περὶ τῶν παιδευομένων εἰς τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν δήλωσον περὶ τοῦ παιδεύεσθαι εἰ οἷόν τε ἐστὶν ἀμελῆ αὐτὸν ὄντα ἄλλους ποιεῖν ἐπιμελεῖς.* We might perhaps prefer *παιδεύοντος* to the infinitive if we had been writing the passage ourselves, but as Mr. Platt allows that *παιδεύειν* could be 'digested,' the passive infinitive is not a much greater strain on the system. If translated 'the training received' it appears to give a better antithesis to *παιδευομένων* than the active. And there is a tendency in Xenophontic Greek to use the passive infinitive where older and more correct Greek has the active. Just above Xenophon has *ἀδύνατος παιδεύεσθαι*, which may be contrasted with *ἀδύνατος κατανοῆσαι* Plato, *Phaed.* p. 90 D.

xix. 9. Why should not *πλείονες γὰρ ἂν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ κατὰ γῆς εἶεν* be translated 'For thus would the suckers be below the earth in greater numbers'? Mr. Platt would tie the Greek article down too tightly. So in Eur. Andr. 1231 *Πηλεῦ, χάριν σῶν τῶν πάρος νυμφευμάτων* where it has only to be observed that *τῶν πάρος* is a qualification of *σῶν*. The traditional reading, rightly explained by Hermann in Paley's note, is not only correct but more subtle, while the position of *σοι* separating *χάριν* from *τῶν πάρος* would require some justification.

I will conclude with a passage of the *Hellenics* of the same writer which has suffered very hardly at the hands of scholars. In the speech of Critias against Theramenes, Xen. *Hell.* ii. 3, 31, occur these words *ὅθεν δήπου [γὰρ] καὶ κόθορνος ἐπικαλεῖται· καὶ γὰρ ὁ κόθορνος ἁρμόττειν μὲν τοῖς ποσὶν ἀμφοτέροις δοκεῖ, ἀποβλέπει δ' ἀπ' ἀμφοτέρων.* The last sentence is generally condemned as spurious. But why any one should have written anything so meaningless as its second half no one has vouchsafed to explain. Critias is making it his business to show that Theramenes has earned his nickname of reversible boot. That boot and statesman shift their place from side to side is an obvious point of resemblance, but there is a less obvious one. It is given in § 32 *σὺ δὲ διὰ τὸ εὐμετάβολος εἶναι πλείστοις μὲν μεταίτιος εἶ ἐξ ὀλίγων ἀπολωλέναι πλείστους δ' ἐκ δημοκρατίας ὑπὸ τῶν βελτιόνων.* What is analogous to this in the conduct of the reversible boot? Obviously that it takes the *skin* off both feet, *ἀ π ο λ έ π ε ι ἀπ' ἀμφοτέρων*. Compare Eur. *Cycl.* 237 (where it has been corrupted to *ἀποθλίψειν*) *μάστιγί τ' εὖ τὸ νῶτον ἀπολέψειν σέθεν.*

J. P. Postgate.

CRITICAL NOTES ON CICERO *DE ORATORE I.*

1, 1 si infinitus forensium rerum labor et ambitionis occupatio decursu honorum, etiam aetatis flexu constitisset

Those that have felt a difficulty in the bare etiam here seem to me to be in the right. The turn of phrase employed by Q. Cicero *de petit.* 2, 9 cum semper natura, tum etiam aetate iam quietum, may help us to the restoration of the passage in the *de orat.* to: etiam aetatis <iam> flexu constitisset

3, 11 vere mihi hoc videor esse dicturus: ex omnibus eis qui in harum artium liberalissimis studiis sint doctrinisque versati minimam copiam poetarum egregiorum exstitisse; atque in hoc ipso numero, in quo perraro exoritur aliquis excellens, si diligenter et ex nostrorum et ex Graecorum copia comparare voles, multo tamen pauciores oratores quam poetae boni reperientur.

Cicero is dealing with the question: Why have there been more distinguished men in every other field than in oratory? In order to the proper treatment of this question he first shews that there have been more distinguished men in every other field. In the artes maximae, represented by the

general and the statesman, the case is beyond cavil (2, 7–8). But the comparison of the orator with the general or with the statesman may be objected to as unfair, on the ground that the orator should be classed rather with scientists and men of letters. The comparison is therefore restricted to the latter sorts (2, 8). It is hard to count the eminent philosophers (2, 9). The mathematicians of renown are not few (3, 10): the same holds good of those that have devoted themselves to musica and of the grammatici (3, 10). Then follows the sentence quoted above. This contains the climax and the conclusion of the comparison. The gist of it is this: Among those that deal with reconditae artes and litterae (cf. 2, 8) the poets constitute the class that has the smallest number of distinguished representatives: and there are fewer good orators than good poets. But can it be for a moment supposed that Cicero would conclude so clear and simple an argument as this in the way in which our MSS. tell us he has? Let us look at the second half of the sentence quoted, beginning with atque in. 'And in this very number, in which very rarely does anyone rise to eminence, if you will make a careful comparison, including both Greeks and Romans, you will yet find much fewer good orators than good poets.' The words in hoc ipso numero (with the appended relative clause, of which more anon) are obviously = in hac minima copia poetarum egregiorum, and the words multo—reperientur therefore include the orators in the special class with which they are contrasted and compared. Dr. Sorof represents those that would accept the text as it stands and assume an anacoluthon. The words in hoc ipso numero are = in poetarum ipsorum numero (a sense which a careful reading of the passage ought to show that they can not bear), and multo—reperientur is "ein durch Zwischensatz veranlasstes Anakoluth, statt: *multo tamen plures egregii reperientur, quam sunt oratores boni*, welches um so erklärlicher ist, als dem Cic. fortwährend die *paucitas oratorum egregiorum* vorschwebt." But even if we disregard the misinterpretation of in hoc ipso numero, can we suppose that Cicero would draw his conclusion so carelessly? The conjecture of Stangl (see Sorof's *Kritischer Anhang*) that the words et oratorum are to be inserted between poetarum and egregiorum in the former half of the sentence merely appears to bring relief. The logical flaw of including one of the two classes compared in the other is still present, though placed one step farther back. (See Sorof's *Krit. Anhang.*) The same remark applies to O. Hense's et oratorum for egregiorum (see Piderit-Harnecker, *Krit. Anhang*)—the conjecture to which Stangl's suggestion is due. We come now to a consideration of the possibility and probability of emendation in the latter part of the sentence, beginning with the words atque in. Kayser in the Tauchnitz text-edition brackets *in* before hoc ipso numero, as well as the words *quam poetae.* Hoc ipso numero will then depend upon the comparative pauciores, and we shall construe: 'And than this very number (*i.e.* the minima copia poetarum egregiorum), in which very rarely does any one rise to eminence, if you will make a careful comparison &c., you will yet find much fewer good orators.' This treatment of the text, however, assumes for the passage as originally written a form that would not of itself have been likely to produce the present form. The difficulty lies in explaining the *in* before hoc ipso numero. How did this fons et origo malorum come into the text? Let us glance at a clause that has thus far passed unchallenged (in its entirety: Rubner [see Piderit-Harnecker, *Krit. Anhang*] has proposed the improbable cum—exoriatur), in quo perraro exoritur aliquis excellens. If hoc ipso numero is, as it obviously is, a mere resumption of minimam copiam poetarum egregiorum, then in quo—excellens is an utterly needless—not to say awkward and absurd—addition. It is an addition such as would be made to an obscure or ambiguous antecedent—and such too as might be made in the margin. Hoc ipso numero is too clear to need such an addition; not so in hoc ipso numero: therefore in quo—excellens presupposes in hoc ipso numero, and it is not enough to bracket *in* and *quam poetae.* Thus it appears probable that in quo—excellens is a gloss, but a gloss that presupposes in before hoc ipso numero. Let us glance now for a moment at atque. It has been proposed to change this atque into the adversative atqui. (By Piderit, who furthermore understood in hoc ipso numero to refer to the preceding ex omnibus, qui in harum—*sc.* mediocrium—artium studiis liberalissimis sunt doctrinisque versati. But, as Adler said, it is harsh not to refer in hoc numero to the immediately preceding minimam copiam poetarum egregiorum.) To this Sorof (*Krit. Anhang*) objects that the necessity of such change is obviated by the following tamen (after multo). However, this objection loses its force from the fact that the sentence is too

fully under weigh before we are put right by the adversative. Then too we think of the familiar collocation at tamen. An adversative at the head of this sentence—an at or an atqui—is just what we should expect; but this of itself gives us no help in our critical problem—in our trouble over in hoc—numero. A. Fleckeisen in his *Kritische Miscellen* (Dresden, 1864, Program des Vitzthumschen Gymnasiums,—referred to by Dr. Sorof) deals (pp. 23–28) with a number of passages in which atque has ousted atqui. The passages which he discusses have in common the peculiarity that the atque that requires change to atqui is followed by a word beginning with *i*. Fleckeisen believes that this is not mere chance but that we are to see in this corruption a trace of the archaic spelling ei for i. Thus, *e.g.* ATQVEILLE or ATQVEILLE would readily pass, under the hand of a scribe, into atque ille. But the admission of the truth or plausibility of this theory brings us no further forward in the present case, unless we suppose that ATQVEIHOC might have been misread as ATQVEĪHOC (atque in hoc). (For the spellings atquei and quein in the MSS. of Cicero see Georges, *Lexicon der Lat. Wortformen s.vv.* atqui and quin.) A more probable assumption than this we can base on the occurrence in two passages in Cicero (*pro domo* 12 atquin utrumque fuisse perspicuum est and *Philip.* 10, 17 atquin huius animum erga M. Brutum studiumque vidistis) of the form atquin. The fact that in the latter of these two passages atquin is followed by a form of hic taken in combination with Fleckeisen's suggestion about the archaic spelling, gives colour to the conjecture that in our passage of the *de oratore* atque in should should be written as one word—atquein. We shall then read:

atquein hoc ipso numero [in quo perraro exoritur aliquis excellens], si diligenter et ex nostrorum et ex Graecorum copia comparare voles, multo tamen pauciores oratores [quam poetae] boni reperientur

Thus Kayser's bracketing of quam poetae is to be accepted, in is retained, and in—excellens is rejected, the difficulty having arisen entirely from a wrong division of ATQVEIN.

3, 12. Should we read here: dicendi autem omnis ratio in medio posita <ita> communi cet., ut—excellat?

4, 13. The traditional text with four aut's is (notwithstanding Professor Wilkins's explanation) very harsh. Reading along naturally we understand: aut pluris ceteris (artibus) inservire aut maiore delectatione (homines eis inservire) aut spe uberiore (eis inservire) aut praemiis ad perdiscendum amplioribus—Here we expect to understand eis inservire (= commotus—or the like—eis inservire) but are confronted with commoveri instead. Wex's ac for the last aut is helpful and not improbably—or impossibly—right, unless Cicero wrote very carelessly here; but it does not help us out of all the difficulty: we have still one aut too many. Should we not read et after inservire? If we do not, can we not fairly say that we are justified in expecting from Cicero's pen: aut spe uberiore *ac* praemiis ad perdiscendum amplioribus *commotos?*

7, 26. hi primo die de temporibus deque universa republica, quam ob causam venerant, multum inter se usque ad extremum tempus diei conlocuti sunt, quo quidem sermone multa divinitus a tribus ille consularibus Cotta deplorata et commemorata narrabat, ut nihil incidisset postea civitati mali, quod non impendere illi tanto ante vidissent

The ut-clause here seems to lack a distinct indication of its exact point of contact with the preceding clause. Divinitus is an emphatic word; to it, therefore, one naturally seeks to link the ut-clause. Even then, however, we miss a particle anticipatory of ut—what Fischer would call its 'syndetic antecedent'. This may, I think, be readily supplied before divinitus. Read multa <ita> divinitus &c. It is obvious that ita could be easily lost after -lta.

10, 42. agerent enim tecum lege primum Pythagorei omnes atque Democritii, ceterique sua in iure physici vindicarent, ... ; urgerent praeterea philosophorum greges iam ab illo fonte et capite Socrate nihil te de bonis rebus in vita, nihil de malis, nihil de animi permotionibus, nihil de hominum moribus, nihil de ratione vitae didicisse, nihil omnino quaesisse, nihil scire convincerent; cet.

The last word in the quotation does not stand in close connection with anything that precedes. It is not linked to urgerent by any copulative and stands at the very end of its clause. We should certainly expect here not a finite form but a participle. Should we not read convincentes?

13, 55. quibus de rebus Aristotelem et Theophrastum scripsisse fateor; sed vide

ne hoc, Scaevola, totum sit a me: nam ego, quae sunt oratori cum illis communia, non mutuor ab illis; ipsi (Kayser, the MSS. isti) quae de his rebus disputant, oratorum esse concedunt, itaque ceteros libros artis suae nomine, hos rhetoricos et inscribunt et appellant.

The last part of this sentence can hardly mean that Aristotle and Theophrastus give their other books a general title belonging to—characteristic of—'their art' (suae artis), while giving to their rhetorical works the general title ῥητορικά. The special subjects mentioned in the next sentence help to show that Cicero meant to say that while they gave their works on other subjects titles indicative of the special departments or sciences (artes) of which the works severally treated, they gave their rhetorical treatises the general tithe ῥητορικά (libri oratorii). But this is not what Cicero's sentence in the traditional form, makes him say. We must restore a lost word. Read: itaque ceteros libros artis suae <quemque> nomine, hos rhetoricos &c.

13, 57 haec ego cum ipsis philosophis tum Athenis disserebam; cogebat enim me M. Marcellus hic noster, qui nunc aedilis curulis est et profecto, nisi ludos nunc faceret, huic nostro sermoni interesset, ac iam tum erat adulescentulus his studiis mirifice deditus.

The sentence seems to me to have received somewhat harsh treatment at the hands of several eminent scholars. In the first place on the authority of some MSS. the tum before Athenis is bracketed (Kayser, Sorof, Wilkins—even third edition, Friedrich; retained by Piderit-Harnecker). Surely the fact that in this sentence the somewhat garrulous speaker is resuming the audivi enim summos homines, cum quaestor ex Macedonia *venissem Athenas* of 11, 45 is abundant reason for its presence. In the latter part of the sentence Cobet bracketed the words nunc aedilis curulis est et, in accordance with his favourite theory of glossal interpolation. This athetesis has been accepted by Kayser and by Professor Wilkins (all three editions). But to this there is a—mea quidem opinione—fatal obstacle, namely the iam tum (Sorof prints tunc) in the contrasted member of the sentence. To this the nunc before faceret is not a sufficient contrast. If there were a glossal interpolation here, the original form of the text would more probably be qui nunc profecto, nisi ludos faceret, huic nostro sermoni interesset. Indeed it may well be said that that is the form in which this part of the sentence would naturally have been cast; for Crassus by his very words hic noster implies that Marcellus is present (cf. huic nostro sermoni) and then corrects himself by saying that Marcellus would surely be present were he not occupied by his duties as aedile. Notwithstanding this, however, the contrasted clause forces us to accept, not merely nunc before aedilis curulis, but also curulis aedilis (for is not this term, implying maturity, contrasted with adulescentulus?), and est too, which is contrasted with erat. Roughly translated, in order to mark its successive corrections and approximations, the sentence runs: 'For I was constrained thereto (*i. e.* ut cum ipsis philosophis dissererem) by M. Marcellus—our friend here—(I mean) the one that *now* is curule aedile and would, of course, were he not at the present moment engaged in superintending the festival, be taking part in this talk of ours, and who already *at that time*, as a mere lad, was surprisingly devoted to these studies'. A lighter punctuation before ac iam tum erat, which forms merely the second member of the relative sentence begun by qui, seems required. I have used a comma instead of the prevailing semicolon. Perhaps the omission of all pointing were better still. The thoroughly conversational tone of the sentence as thus explained is not its least charm.

By way of appendix to the notes on *De Oratore I.* I venture to add the following suggestions of changes of reading in *de Oratore II.*

5, 19 tum Catulus 'ne Graeci quidem,' inquit, 'Crasse, qui in civitatibus suis clari et magni fuerunt, sicuti tu es nosque omnes in nostra republica volumus esse, <nec> horum Graecorum, qui se inculcant auribus nostris, similes fuerunt [nec in otio (or, [nec] tamen in otio)—fugiebant; cet.

29, 127 hic Crassus 'quin tu,' inquit, 'Antoni, omitte s<is> ista (MSS. omittis ista), quae proposuisti, quae nemo desiderat.

There is also a passage in the *de lege Manilia* (4, 10) that is very clearly wrong. Read: ut neque vera laus ei detracta oratione mea neque falsa adfixa (not adficta!) esse videatur. Of course, the error

is due to the preceding falsa,—e falso falsum. (Unless, indeed, adficta be regarded as the archaic form of adfixa: see Munro on Lucr. 3, 4: in either case, however, the contrast with detracta makes it reasonably certain that we have to do with a participle of adfigere not of adfingere).

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.
Bryn Mawr College.

NOTE ON CURTIUS VI. 4, 7.

THE Ziobetis, a rapid mountain-stream, suddenly plunges into an abyss and, after a subterranean course of some forty miles, again emerges to the surface.

Being told by the natives, that all that is thrown into the chasm, where the water disappears, is given back by the stream at its reappearance,

Alexander duos, qua subeunt aquae terram, praecipitari iubet, quorum corpora, ubi rursus erumpit, expulsa videre, qui missi erant, ut exciperent.

This is the unanimous reading of the elder MSS.: only in the Florent. G, an interpolated one, someone has inserted *tauros* after *duos*, which ancient editors have adopted. Hedicke and Vogel however justly rejected it as lacking positive authority. Of late Kinch declared the interpolation justified.

Now let us put the question; what most likely was taken by Alexander as an object for his experiment? If living men, firstly Curtius would have added to *duos*, which is not definite enough in itself, such a word as *viros* or *incolas:* secondly, such a useless cruelty does not agree with Alexander's nature. Indeed for this reason ancient editors adopted the reading *tauros*. If not men, which were his victims? Animals of course, as by the following *corpora* lifeless matters are at once excluded. What animals would he have sacrificed most probably? If bulls, some reference would have been given whence he got them. Little animals would not do, for they might have passed by unseen or have been caught by a rock. Now we are informed in § 3, that he came there *cum phalange et equitatu.* So the assumption is near at hand, that he took horses: should therefore *equos* be inserted after *duos?* No. Firstly, that manner of correcting is very arbitrary and far too often applied to Curtius by modern critics, and secondly, Alexander did not take two horses from elsewhere, but two of *his* horses; so *duos equorum* is the expression required.

Now let us read the passage again. Does not *quorum* strike us then as a pedantic addition, quite different from Curtius' rather easy and poetical style? It is clear that the men, who were sent to look for the reappearance of the bodies, saw the bodies of the horses—not of other animals emerge from the whirlpool. So I suggest:

Alexander duos, qua subeunt aquae terram, praecipitari iubet equorum: corpora, ubi rursus erumpit, expulsa videre, qui missi erant, ut exciperent.

P. H. DAMSTÉ.
LEIDEN, 1 *December* 1896.

NOTE ON JUVENAL *SAT.* X. 82 *foll.*

pallidulus mi
Bruttidius meus ad Martis fuit obvius aram.
quam timeo victus ne poenas exigat Aiax
ut male defensus!

No satisfactory explanation seems to have been found for this passage. After the death of Sejanus, every one (in mortal terror of informers) is doing his best by word and deed to show his hatred of the fallen favourite, and so to conciliate Tiberius. And every one is afraid that something he has done, or has left undone, may be distorted into an appearance of disloyalty. What is the cause of the anxiety of Bruttidius the orator; and how does the wrath of Ajax come into the question?

Mayor, ad loc., says that "Sejanus is the

Ajax ill-defended, who avenges himself on his luke-warm advocate, gloating over his terrors from the other world." This seems to be very unintelligible. Weidner is right in identifying Ajax with Tiberius; but he needlessly alters *victus* to *victis*, in construction with *timeo*, adding the comment: "Er wüthete gegen die Anhänger Sejans und den Senat (*victis*); es fühlte sich niemand mehr sicher, und es war zu fürchten dass er das ganze Volk in seiner Raserei anfallen würde...*ut male defensus*, vom Senat (*victis*) der dem Sejan sich allzu sehr ergeben gezeigt hatte." This does not seem to account satisfactorily for the introduction of Ajax.

I do not pretend to offer a convincing interpretation, but a passage in Suetonius, Tib. cap. 61, seems to suggest a simpler explanation. The attitude of Tiberius is there described in these words: omne crimen pro capitali receptum, etiam paucorum simpliciumque verborum. Obiectum est poetae quod in tragoedia Agamemnona probris lacessisset, etc. This must mean that Tiberius, in his crazy egotism, identified himself with the principal Greek heroes, and resented any attack upon them, or any neglect of their interests, as a personal affront. Here comes in the bitter irony of Juvenal. Not only was there danger that Tiberius might consider himself attacked in the person of Agamemnon, but it was not even safe for an orator to declaim the Armorum Iudicium; for the Emperor might be whimsical enough to make a *volte face*, and to put himself in the place of Ajax, considering that the orator had not loyally championed his cause, and so had contributed to his defeat in the trial (*victus*). This is the very word used in the famous tragedy of Accius—"si autem vincar, vinci a tali nullum mihi est probrum." The genuine fear of Bruttidius as to the possible misinterpretation of his 'simplicia verba' is very significant. The annotation of Torrentius, in the Variorum notes on Suetonius, l.c., refers to Dion. 1. 58 as follows: "Simile est quod de Scauro [narrat], is enim ob tragoediam quamdam suam, cui Atreus nomen fecerat, quia Euripidis verbis quidam in ea alterum monuerat ut stultitiam imperantis ferret, a Tiberio mortem sibi consciscere coactus est."

It was by no means unusual in the Roman theatre to make pointed reference to the politics of the day, by throwing special emphasis on some particular lines in a popular play. So, when the *Simulans* of Afranius was acted in B.C. 57, in the presence of Cicero's friend, the consul Lentulus Spinther, the words "haec, taeterrime, sunt postprincipia atque exitus malae vitiosae vitae" were uttered so markedly at Clodius, that he was glad to escape the storm of hisses and to quit the theatre. (Cic. pro Sest. 55.)

W. W. MERRY.

NOTE ON LUCRETIUS V. 436 *SEQQ.*

Sed nova tempestas quaedam molesque coorta
Omne genus de principiis discordia quorum
Intervalla vias conexus pondera plagas
Concursus motus turbabat proelia miscens
Propter dissimilis formas variasque figuras
Quod non omnia sic poterant coniuncta manere.

MUNRO translates the last two lines of this passage thus: 'because by reason of their unlike forms and varied shapes they could not all remain thus joined together.' What does '*thus* joined' mean?

Dr. Duff in the Pitt Press edition says: '*sic* "straight off, at once," οὑτωσί.' Can this interpretation be justified?

Lewis and Short s. v. *sic* p. 1691*a* say: 'a local demonstrative accompanied with a corresponding gesture.' If so, what is the exact meaning here?

I suggest that a simpler and better explanation is to take *sic* in the ordinary sense of 'thus' or 'such,' equivalent to *dissimilia formis figurisque*, and standing to *omnia* (of which the direct predicate is *poterant coniuncta manere*) in the relation of secondary predicate denoting the character in which or circumstances under which a person or thing acts or is acted upon (Roby, *Lat. Gram.* § 1017 c). For this use of *sic* cf. Ter. *Phorm.* 210 *seqq. voltum contemplamini: en, satin' sic est*, where *sic* must mean 'being, or when, like this;' *i.e.* 'will my face do like this?' Verg. *Aen.* v. 619 *seqq. fit Beroe...ac sic Dardanidum mediam se matribus infert*, where *sic* = *Beroae similis*,[1] *Beroen simulans*. Juv. iv. 90 *seqq. nec civis erat qui libera posset | verba animi proferre et vitam impendere vero | sic multas*

[1] Cf. *Aen.* i. 588 restitit Aeneas...deo similis.

hiemes...vidit. Here *sic* = 'being a man of this kind.' Mart. 2, 1, 11 *seqq. esse tibi tanta cautus brevitate videris? | hei mihi, quam multis sic quoque longus eris!* Here *sic* = *brevis* suggested by *brevitate*. Cf. also the use of *talis* in Ter. *Eun.* 160 *ne illum talem praeripiat tibi.* Verg. *G.* 3, 92, *talis et ipse iubam cervice effudit equina | Saturnus.*

Sic, a colourless term, requires in English a rendering coloured to suit the context, and therefore should in this passage of Lucretius be translated by 'thus unlike, being thus unlike.' With the interpretation which I suggest we obtain perfect sense and *propter ...figuras* goes with *proelia miscens*, a more natural order.

J. Stanley.

CAN A SHORT VOWEL RESIST POSITION?

This is the question raised by Prof. Platt's note in the *Classical Review* for last month. He announces a law that a syllable naturally short cannot be lengthened at the end of the fourth foot of an hexameter by position unless it forms a monosyllabic word, and unless the consonant or consonants lengthening it are part of the same word. I had never heard of this metrical canon before, and I have not yet met any one who has. Let me premise that in my judgment we owe nothing but thanks to Prof. Platt for introducing us to the law, which (as I learn by a kind communication from him) was originally propounded by Hilberg, and stated not very correctly in van Leeuwen's *Enchiridion Dictionis Epicae.* It is by the propounding and careful weighing of such generalisations that knowledge grows.

But I think it may be questioned whether the undoubted fact that '*instantiae contradictoriae*' are extremely rare points here to a law rather than a coincidence. The spondee in the bucolic caesura is very rare, and when we put aside the cases in which the last syllable of the spondee is naturally long, and the cases where though naturally short it is a monosyllable, and the cases where it is lengthened by position but by a consonant which is part of the same word, the remaining cases must of necessity be very few indeed. The law rests on no principle, but only on what Bacon calls *nuda enumeratio.* If I were to promulgate a law that the fourth foot of a hexameter must never contain a ψ, I fancy it would not be difficult to prove it by appealing to Homer's poems, but if I were to add 'unless there is a verb within two verses,' probably the rule thus qualified would not labour under a single exception.

Such an illustration may seem to be extravagant; but I do not think it is more extravagant or more arbitrary than the principle which distinguishes so sharply between the lengthening by position within and without the word, and between length by nature and length by position. This brings me back to the question which I have put at the head of this paper. Can a short vowel resist the lengthening effect of position? Surely it cannot. If a syllable cannot be shortened, it is in the fullest sense of the word long, and if it is fully long it cannot be longer. If then it so happens that the instances are very rare in which the fourth foot is a spondee having the last syllable not monosyllabic and lengthened by position outside the word, the reason may well be because there are very few words which comply with all those complicated conditions, and not because the poets deliberately avoided such words.

I would add that I do not urge these considerations out of any tenderness for my suggestion *κἄρμα*, in which I do not believe at all. The only conjecture which I have made on the *Hymns* with a complete belief in its truth is *ἔσσο* for *ἐσσί* in *Herm.* 33, and I have no reason up to the present to believe that any one shares my confidence in its soundness. It has not been noticed by any of the recent writers on the *Hymns.*

R. Y. Tyrrell.

THE LENGTHENING OF FINAL SYLLABLES BY POSITION BEFORE THE FIFTH FOOT IN THE HOMERIC HEXAMETER.

In a note on *Hym. Dem.* 268–9 in the last issue of the *Classical Review*, Mr. Arthur Platt lays down as a metrical rule for Greek hexameters, 'that a syllable naturally short cannot be lengthened at the end of the fourth foot by position unless it form a monosyllabic word.' I trust Mr. Platt, whose courteous reference to myself makes dissent an unwelcome, if not an ungracious task, will forgive me, if I venture to doubt the validity of this canon for Homer and the earlier epic. The point is of capital importance for Homeric criticism apart entirely from the above mentioned passage from the *Hymns*, which may for the moment be left out of account. This rule, Mr. Platt says in effect, and I desire no better authority, is even more stringently observed by the later hexameter writers. From this I infer, and the conclusion seems by no means an unfair one, that the rule is the invention and creation of these later writers themselves. In that case the extent of its applicability to the Homeric poems would be an open question. For if we are dealing, as I suggest, with what is merely a late refinement in versification, we need not be at all surprised to find that the metre of Homer exhibits a general conformity therewith, a conformity in part of course originally inherent, in part, as I shall show, artificially superinduced. The Greeks, we may be sure, would not allow, if by a process of moderate correction and improvement they could prevent it, that 'The Poet' should lack an excellence that any of his successors possessed. There are, if I am not mistaken, certain features in the Homeric poems, which lend considerable support to my proposed restriction of Mr. Platt's rule. First of all the recurrent *βοῶπις πότνια Ἥρη*, to which he refers, is clearly an old formulaic line, and, as might be expected, if my supposition be true, exhibits no consciousness of any such rule. I confess I am loth to believe in the long *ι* of *βοῶπις*, and still less in that of the voc. *βοῶπι*, which I take to be the outcome of some strait-laced grammarians' refusal to recognise the primitive use of the nom. as voc. (cf. Cobet, *Mis. Crit.* p. 333 f.). *γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη* is a standing protest against the idea of *βοώπις*. Such words as *πόλις*, *κλείς*, and *ὄρνις*, evidently stand on a different footing. Φ 126 may in deference to Mr. Platt's opinion, be given up; but we cannot disregard:—

Ο 189 *τριχθὰ δὲ πάντα δέδαστο, ἕκαστος δ' ἔμμορε τιμῆς·*
λ 338 *ξεῖνος δ' αὖτ' ἐμός ἐστι, ἕκαστος δ' ἔμμορε τιμῆς.*
ζ 93 *αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πλῦνάν τε κάθηράν τε ῥύπα πάντα,*
Β 842 *τῶν ἦρχ' Ἱππόθοός τε Πύλαιός τ' ὄζος Ἄρηος,*
Β 813 *τὴν ἦ τοι ἄνδρες Βατίειαν κικλήσκουσιν,*
Λ 189 *τόφρ' ἀναχωρείτω, τὸν δ' ἄλλον λαὸν ἀνώχθω.*
796 *ἀλλά σέ περ προέτω, ἅμα δ' ἄλλος λαὸς ἑπέσθω.*
Π 38 *ἀλλ' ἐμέ περ πρόες ὦχ', ἅμα δ' ἄλλον λαὸν ὄπασσον.*
Σ 400 *τῆσι παρ' εἰνάετες χάλκευον δαίδαλα πολλά.*

[Add also M 20.]

I find also:—

Β 522 *οἵ τ' ἄρα πὰρ ποταμὸν Κηφισὸν δῖον ἔναιον,*

where Mr. Platt might well have adopted Bentley's Κηφισοῦ (*i.e.* *-όο*). There may be more; but the above instances will suffice. I refrain from quoting the lines ending *περίφρον Πηνελόπεια* for the reason given above.

Let me now propound certain passages, which seem to me to exhibit the handiwork of the enthusiast engaged in bringing Homer up to date.

Η 467 *νῆες δ' ἐκ Λήμνοιο παρέστασαν οἶνον ἄγουσαι*

Here Bentley restored *παρέσταν*. Mr. Platt accepts it, and is surely right in so doing.

η 114 *ἔνθα δὲ δένδρεα μακρὰ πεφύκασι τηλεθόωντα,*

The monstrous form *πεφύκασι* with *α* short seems to be a desperate evasion of *πέφυκεν*. The *πεφύκει* of the MSS. is another, for obviously the time required is present.

Φ 602 *εἷος ὁ τὸν πεδίοιο διώκετο πυροφόροιο,*
σ 8 *ὅς ῥ' ἐλθὼν Ὀδυσῆα διώκετο οἷο δόμοιο,*

There is no other example of *διώκομαι*

transitive in Homer. In both cases it seems highly probable that δίωκεν was the original.

Δ 331 *οὐ γάρ πώ σφιν ἀκούετο λαὸς ἀυτῆς,*

There is here a probability of equal, or even stronger, cogency in favour of ἄκουεν, for ἀκούετο is a flagrant solecism, v. Leaf, *ad loc.*

χ 330 *Τερπιάδης δ' ἔτ' ἀοιδὸς ἀλύσκανε κῆρα μέλαιναν.*

ἀλύσκανε is Wolf's reading for ἀλύσκαζε, which, as the scansion shows, must be an interloper: but since ἀλυσκάνω is not found elsewhere, perhaps ἄλυσκεν might put in a better claim to be the evicted tenant. The familiar aor. ἀλεύατο is of course excluded by the sense.

Φ 194 *τῷ οὔτε κρείων Ἀχελώιος ἰσοφαρίζει,*
Ω 616 *νυμφάων αἵ τ' ἀμφ' Ἀχελώιον ἐρρώσαντο,*

That Ἀχελῷος -ον should be read is hardly open to doubt. Confirmatory is:—

Hes. Theog. 340 *Φᾶσίν τε Ῥῆσόν τ' Ἀχελῷόν τ' ἀργυροδίνην*

where the omission of τε is plainly impossible, whatever MSS. may say.

Β 750 *οἵ τ' ἀμφ' Ἰμερτὸν Τιταρήσιον ἔργ' ἐνέμοντο,*

This case is similar to the preceding. The name of the river was Titaresus, and Bentley's correction Τιτάρησον is, even apart from the digamma, certain.

Ε 706 *Τρῆχόν τ' αἰχμητὴν Αἰτώλιον Οἰνόμαόν τε,*

Here again I cannot think Bentley was wrong in reading Αἰτωλόν in spite of the resulting molossus, cf. Ν 506 Ἰδομενεὺς δ' ἄρα Οἰνόμαον.

λ 484 *πρὶν μὲν γάρ σε ζωὸν ἐτίομεν ἶσα θεοῖσιν Ἀργεῖοι,*

The original was in all probability ἔτιον. The alteration would be inevitable.

ι 530 *δὸς μὴ Ὀδυσσῆα πτολιπόρθιον οἶκαδ' ἱκέσθαι.*

The form in common use is πτολίπορθος. Whether πτολίπορθον should be introduced I hesitate to say. As a correction it has at any rate the merit of simplicity.

Ρ 387 *χεῖρές τ' ὀφθαλμοί τε παλάσσετο μαρναμένοιιν*

This striking schema Pindaricum, unparalleled in Homer, may be traced with some probability to the devoted care of a reviser, whose metrical conscience could not tolerate πάλαχθεν = παλάχθησαν. Being ἅπαξ λεγ. this 3 plur. aor. pass. would have to yield almost without a struggle in face of the attractions of so select a grammatical figure, all the more irresistible, because its adoption here increased the comprehensiveness of Homer's supposed universality.

Σ 583 *ἔγκατα καὶ μέλαν αἷμα λαφύσσετον· οἱ δὲ νομῆες*
Κ 364 *λαοῦ ἀποτμήξαντε διώκετον ἐμμενὲς αἰεί.*
Ν 346 *ἄνδρασιν ἠρώεσσιν ἐτεύχετον ἄλγεα λυγρά.*

In these lines instead of the questionable duals Dr. Maguire has proposed λάφυσσον· τοῖς, next δίωκον νωλεμές, and for the third with less probability ἔτευχον κήδεα.

Φ 343 *πρῶτα μὲν ἐν πεδίῳ πῦρ δαίετο, καῖε δὲ νεκρούς*

No doubt δαίετο may be passive here: but if Hephaestus be the subject to both verbs, as is perhaps more likely, δαῖεν would be in accordance with usage. δαῖεν πῦρ would suit Mr. Platt's rule. In any case the passage is worth mentioning, as also are:—

Ψ 748 *καὶ τὸν Ἀχιλλεὺς θῆκεν ἀέθλια οὗ ἑτάροιο,* ἄεθλον Bentley.
Η 277 *μέσσῳ δ' ἀμφοτέρων σκῆπτρα σχέθον, εἶπέ τε μῦθον* σκῆπτρ' ἔσχον van Leeuwen and da Costa. ἦρχε?
ξ 295 *ἐς Λιβύην μ' ἐπὶ νηὸς ἐφέσσατο ποντοπόροιο.* ἔφεσσεν?

In δ 646 I would suggest that the peculiar ἀπηύρατο is the result of an unwarrantable lurking fear lest ἀπηύρα had the final α short by nature.

In some instances appearances may have been saved by the intervention of that deus ex machina, hiatus licitus, e.g.

β 57 *εἰλαπινάζουσιν πίνουσί τε αἴθοπα οἶνον*

Here Bentley's *πίνουσίν τ'* has the support of the notable and telling parechesis. In *β* 325, *Hym.* vii. 31 et sim. *ἡμῖν*, if as is sometimes supposed, it represents an original *ἄμμιν*, would be an instance.

Mr. Platt's opinion on a metrical question carries great weight and deservedly so; but I think the evidence above detailed is sufficient to justify, or at least to render highly probable, the modification I have ventured to propose, suggested as it [is by his own statement of the facts. It is easy to point to analogous instances of later refinements and limitations in metrical usage, which have been largely obtruded upon Homer to the great detriment of the text. Many elisions, afterwards prohibited or considerably restricted, were legitimate enough in the early Epic, that of *ι* in the dat. sing. and plur., that of the diphthong *-οι* in the dat. sing. of the personal pronouns and that of *-αι* in certain verb forms. Similarly the final *ε* of the optative *-ειε*, not elided in later Attic, was certainly elided by Homer. The natural consequence has been in this particular case, that the MSS. present us with several instances of a fut. indic. with hiatus following (cf. *α* 404), nor indeed has this deliberate, though well-intended, falsification everywhere been rejected even now.

Possibly the disappearance of *ἦε* in favour of *ἔσκε* before a consonant is a phenomenon due to a similar cause, cf. Π 464 *ἦεν ἄνακτος*, where thanks to ignorance of the digamma *ἔσκε* has not been put in.

With respect to *Hym. Dem.* 269 it is important to notice that *ὄνειαρ* is not due to anybody's conjecture. Had it been so, the case might be different: but so far we are dealing with the MS. reading, which is a little plethoric,

ἀθανάτοις θνητοῖσιν ὄνειαρ καὶ χάρμα τέτυκται.

Furthermore *ὄνειαρ* is a word well established in epic usage v. X 433, 486, δ 444, ο 78. So I still cherish a hope that we may at last be spared the needless spectacle of the unauthenticated, though analogical, *ὄνεαρ*, in favour of which I am sorry to see from your Nov. issue Mr. T. W. Allen betrays an unfortunate weakness. Whether he relies also on the metrical canon here disputed, there is so far nothing to show. Di melius.

Allow me to add in reference to Mr. Monro's communication (*Class. Rev* Dec. 1896), that I regret having inadvertently omitted to notice Mr. Allen's responsibility for the *Hymns* in the Oxford Homer.

T. L. Agar.

GREEK METRICAL INSCRIPTIONS FROM PHRYGIA.

(*Continued from Vol. X. pp.* 420–1.)

I. 14 and III. 2.

A number of examples of λῦγρός from literature are given by Al. Rzach in a careful paper entitled 'Zur Metrik der Oracula Sibyllina' (in *Wiener Studien* xv. (1893) 103).

I. 13. It should have been mentioned that the stone, which is very faint here, seems to read ΟΙΚΕΤΩΝ or ΟΙΚΕΤΩΝ. Κ is a common symbol for *κέ*, *i.e. καί*.

IV.

Found in the cemetery, Yaliniz Serai.

Σύμμαχος Ἀντύλ[λου
κὲ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ Ἄντ[υλ-
λος κὲ Ἀλέξανδρος [κὲ
Σύμμαχος κατὰ χ[ρησ-
μὸν Κλαρίῳ Ἀπόλλωνι ἀν[έσ-
τησαν. χρησμό[ς.
Εἴσατέ μοι βωμὸν π[αν]θηέα τῇδ' ἐνὶ χώρῃ,
ε]ἰς αὐγὰς ἀθρέοντα πολυσκόπου ἠελίοιο,
εὐαγίας δ' ἐπὶ τοῦδε τε[λ]είετε μηνὸς ἑκάστο[υ,
ὄφρα κεν ἀλκήτωρ τε[λέ]θων τὰ συνώρια τεύχω.
παγ]κάρπων γὰρ ἐγὼ πέλομ[αι μ]ερόπεσσι παρέκτω[ρ
οὓς] ἐθέλω σώης τε κὲ [οἷς] κλέος οἶδα φορέσκειν.

This is an inscription on an altar, erected by order of an oracle from the Clarian Apollo.

5. For the Apollo of Klaros (near Kolophon, see Preller, *griech. Mythol.* I⁴. pp. 283 (where in n. 4 other refl. are given), 286; and the excellent art. in Pauly-Wis-

sowa, *Real-Encycl.* II.² (1896); six of his oracles are given in Cougny's *Anthology* (Par. 1890), p. 490. Κλαρίῳ is inserted in smaller letters above the line. 7. *πανθηής*, 'visible from all sides': a word unknown to Stephanus, Liddell and Scott, or Sophocles (Boston, 1870). 8. With *πολυσκ. ἠελ.* cf. Pindar fragm. (74 Boeckh, 84 Bergk), *Ἀκτὶς Ἀελίου, τί πολύσκοπ' ἐμήσω ἐμῶν μᾶτερ ὀμμάτων;* 9. *εὐαγία* is quoted by L-S only from Iamblichus, and not in the sense required here: *purification, purificatory offerings.* 10. A very difficult line. *ἀλκήτωρ* is not elsewhere found, but evidently has the sense of the usual epithets, *ἀλεξίκακος, ἀποτρόπαιος*, applied to this god. The *ν* of *τελέθων* is engraved above the line. Of *συνώρια* the *ω* and the curved part of the *ρ* are worn, but visible on the stone. Its meaning is not certain. I had connected it with *συνήορος, συνωρίς* &c.; but I now prefer the suggestion of Mr. Marindin, who takes it as a compound of *ὥριος*, comparing *σύγκαιρος*: tr. 'I may produce the seasonable fruits.' 11. Can the writer have coined a word *παρέκτωρ* (from *παρέχω*), 'provider'? The sense seems to require this, and the strange word may be defended by the presence of others in the inscr. For the formation, cf. *ἕκτωρ* from the simple *ἔχω*. 12. *σώης*, perhaps intended as acc. pl. masc. of *σῶος, σῶς*. The form is erroneous. I have searched for it in vain in the ancient and modern grammarians. The writer of this inscr., in spite of his apparent talent for inventing words, was evidently very ignorant of Greek. Prof. Ramsay's view is probably to be preferred. ['I believe CΩHC is an engraver's error for CΩCH, *i.e.* *σῶσ(αι)*. On the spelling *η* for *αι*, compare my note on inscr. 678 in *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia* ii. p. 742 (where *ῥύση* for *ῥύσαι, κὴ* for *καί, πηδίον* for *παιδίον, λῆλαψ* for *λαῖλαψ*, etc., are quoted)' W. M. R.] *φορέσκειν*: an unique infin., cf. the impf. *φέρεσκον*.

V.

Found at Eski Sheher.

Ἀγαθῇ Τύχῃ.
Λατογενεῖ Διδύμᾳ Σενεκᾶς εὔτυκτον ἔ[θη]κεν
βωμὸν κ[αὶ] ξεστὰν τάνδ' [ἐφ]ύπερθε πλάκ[α,
εὐδρανίης τε θ[ε]οῦ σημ[ήϊ]α τᾶς (σ)φε[τ]έρας τε
εὐσεβίης μνάμαν ὧν ἀγαθῶν ἔπαθε[ν.

1. Λατογ. Διδύμα = Ἀρτέμιδι. 2. *πλάκα* = 'stone, tablet.' 3. *εὐδράνεια· ἰσχύς* (Hesych.) Cf. also *Concordance to the LXX.* by Hatch and Redpath s.v. W. M. R. tr. 'both as a mark of the power of the goddess, and as a remembrance of his own piety (in return for or on account of) the benefits which he received'—or better—'as mark both of power of goddess and of his own piety, a remembrance of the benefits he received.'

A. Souter.
Caius College, Cambridge.

(To be continued).

ROMAN BURIAL.

In the November number of the *Classical Review* (p. 394), Mr. Warde Fowler criticised my 'Worship of the Romans.' In the course of his review he singled out two sentences of mine relating to the burial customs of early Rome, called attention to their inaccuracy, and produced them as typical of the whole book. I should be glad to think that I had no more serious errors laid to my charge.

'Servius,' I noticed, 'says that the ancient custom was to bury the dead in the house.'' He makes this statement at least twice, ad *Aen.* v. 64, vi. 152. Mr. Fowler speaks of the primitive hill-communities near Rome as having given up the savage custom of burial in or close to the house before the foundation of Rome. I hope that I am not misinterpreting Mr. Fowler, if I conclude that he allows the custom of burial in or near the house to have been primitive (p. 395, col. *a.*). In this event Servius would still be right substantially, although he seems to Mr. Fowler to bring the custom too far down. Not only Servius but Isidore, *Origines* xv. 11, 1 makes the statement that the custom of burial in the house used to be general. Both Servius and Isidore had evidence before them that we have not, and it is possible that they voiced a tradition which was continuous from the primitive usage which Mr. Fowler seems to

concede, and which, however that may be, commends itself to me.

The argument by negation on which Mr. Fowler lays so much stress, is exceedingly difficult to establish. Does the evidence justify us in denying that the Romans ever buried their dead in the house? On the other hand, we have the prohibition contained in the Twelve Tables. It is surely a safe assumption that cases of burial in the city occurred, or else they would not have been forbiddden; just as the heavy fine imposed six centuries later by Hadrian (*Dig.* xlvii. 12, 3) leads one to think that cases of such burial occurred then. Now a pontifical law forbad interment in public soil, (Cic. *de Legg.* ii. 58). It seems a fair inference that, of the burials on private ground, some must have taken place in the plots attached to the dwelling. Noble families were unlikely to entrust their dead to a common burying ground within the walls, even supposing such to have existed. Mr. Fowler seems to overlook the fact that I am only concerned to prove a survival. For that reason I qualified the quotation from Servius by the inference from the law of the Twelve Tables. At any rate some isolated cases of such burial as I am contending for, must, I think, be conceded. The whole of the chapter, from which Mr. Fowler quotes, is based on the assumption that the souls of the dead were believed to haunt the dwelling. I will simply remind the reader of the ritual of the Lemuria described by Ovid, *Fasti* v. 429 ff. The references to burial customs are intended to illustrate this belief, and receive confirmation from it (cf. Fustel de Coulanges *La Cité Antique*[14] p. 30).

The other sentence on which Mr. Fowler is so severe, states that the dead were buried in the courtyard until the time of the Twelve Tables, and that the bodies of young infants were placed in niches in the wall of the house. This sentence is practically in agreement with a recent work on Roman antiquities, which Mr. Fowler himself introduced and recommended to the readers of this review (vol. ii. p. 201). I mean Voigt's work in Iwan Müller's handbook, vol. iv. The passages from the handbook run as follows: (p. 794) 'Children under forty days old, were buried under the eaves overlooking the court in a *subgrundarium*.' Again, 'the town householder was buried in the garden of his plot until the time of the Twelve Tables.' No one seems to know exactly what the *subgrundarium* was; supposing it not to have been an invention of that unscrupulous person Fulgentius. The *columbaria* offer a tempting analogy. I do not claim priority here (cf. L. and S. *s.v.*).

Why should Mr. Fowler, in his capacity of moral assessor—compare his account of my conscience—be so hard upon me, and warn the readers of the *Classical Review* against me as an individual not to be trusted, while Prof. Voigt, who must plead guilty on a similar count, is let off with a mild reprimand? He is rebuked for having given too many references, and that is about all (*C.R.* vol. ii. 201). Not even the most severe critic would say that I had given too many references.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Fowler has mistaken the plan of my book. It was written less as an archaeological handbook than as a contribution to the history of religion. I tried to view the beliefs by which the Romans lived and died, with the eyes of Virgil and Livy and Tibullus, in order that through their thoughts I might get back to the Rome of a little earlier date. I shall look forward with interest to Mr. Warde Fowler's forthcoming work on the same subject in the hope that my own modest investigations may be supplemented by Mr. Fowler's wide acquaintance with early Roman archaeology. But there is a maxim of Aristotle which will intrude, as I think about primitive beliefs. He enjoins upon us always to seek an accuracy that corresponds to the matter in hand, and the attainable accuracy *there* is very limited. On the other hand, we have a considerable amount of evidence about religious beliefs under the late republic and the early empire. There we are on fairly firm ground.

FRANK GRANGER.

I am indebted to the kindness of the editor for a sight in proof of Mr. Granger's remarks on my notice of his book. I do not think that a reviewer is called upon to justify his general opinion of a book entrusted to him for criticism: I hope it may be presumed that writers in this review take pains with their work, and are not likely to mistake the plan or object of the works they report upon. But I gladly express my regret that anything I wrote should have irritated Mr. Granger: and in regard to one particular expression which seems to have annoyed him, I can assure him that he has entirely misunderstood me. I will not waste

space in explaining that I accused him of no moral delinquency in the sentence to which he alludes in his third paragraph.

Let me turn to the question of fact, or rather of probability, on which he has a perfect right to attack me. Was he justified in stating definitely that 'until the Twelve Tables the Romans were at any rate buried in the courtyard of the house'? I observe that he now qualifies this statement. 'Isolated cases of such burial as I am contending for must, I think, be conceded.' Certainly: we know of such even after the Decemvirate. Cicero mentions two or three in the passage Mr. Granger quotes from the *de Legibus*, and Marquardt has collected others (*Privatalthertlhümer* i. p. 350 note); but an examination of Marquardt's references will show that these were cases of special exemption from a rule, '*virtutis causa*' as Cicero says, like our burials in cathedrals at the present day. Mr. Granger may argue that if we find such exceptional cases after the Twelve Tables, we may guess that before that date the practice was common. But this would not be a sound inference. It can hardly be doubted that the chief work of the Decemvirs was not to make new rules, but to sum up the body of existing ones. And we may safely carry this one back as far at least as the building of the Servian wall, which no doubt contained within its circuit old burial-places such as those on the Viminal and Esquiline (Lanciani, *Pagan and Christian Rome*, p. 254), belonging to the communities which went to make up the united city. These would then cease to be used, by decree of the Pontifices,[1] and new cemeteries be brought into use outside the new walls.

This is at least the inference which we must draw from archaeological evidence, which seems to me quite decisive on the point. Italy is full of ancient nekropoleis, and only one case is known to me in which they are within the ancient walls of a city. They were cities of the dead outside the cities of the living; see for example von Duhn's summary of recent excavation in Italy in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* for April 1896, p. 130, or the accounts of excavations at Falerii and Narce in the *Monumenti Antichi* for 1895. The fact that they were often *just* outside the walls led no doubt in some cases to their incorporation within the limits of a growing city, and to rules such as that of the Twelve Tables. This extension of wall-circuit may explain, as was suggested by Sir E. Bunbury in the Dict. of Geography, the exceptional case to which I alluded just now, that of the Greek city of Tarentum, which found it desirable to support the singularity of its custom by the aid of an oracle (quoted by Polybius viii. 30). A sketch map of Tarentum which accompanies a well-known paper by Mr. A. J. Evans in the *Hellenic Journal* (vol. vii) shows the tombs occupying a position which would seem to confirm Bunbury's conjecture. But the point for us is that the Tarentines went on burying within an extended circle of wall, and evidently surprised Polybius by so unusual a practice.

But Mr. Granger quotes Voigt in support of his view that burials went on within the city down to the time of the Decemvirate. I have looked at the short passage in which Voigt touches on the question in his handbook, and am surprised to find that he dismisses it so cursorily. Even Kirchmann three centuries ago, whose work '*de funeribus*' has been the foundation of all that has since been written on the subject, declined to commit himself on this point, simply on the ground of legendary instances of burial outside the walls. (Bk. ii. ch. 20). Perhaps I should apologise to Mr. Granger for finding fault with a statement which he drew from Professor Voigt: but I wish he had gone a little further into the question before reproducing the unqualified opinion even of a German professor.

Perhaps he will answer that he did so,—that he quoted Servius and Isidorus. I trust he will forgive me if I venture to assert that neither Servius nor the learned Spanish bishop can carry much weight in a question of this kind, in the absence of better evidence. They say that burial was originally in the house: and they had access, Mr. Granger says, to evidence which we do not possess. To what kind of evidence? That of the practice of primitive peoples existing in their time, or that of, say, the *Antiquitates Humanae* of Varro, to which both were no doubt largely indebted? If the former, they would surely have mentioned it: if the latter, whence did Varro himself derive his information? It is of course just possible that, as Mr. Granger suggests, there was a dim tradition of primitive custom underlying these statements, but we cannot

[1] Such a decree is that which Mr. Granger quotes from Cicero in his third paragraph. His inference from it does not seem to me legitimate: Cicero closely connects it with the law affecting the whole space within the pomoerium. 'Sed in urbe sepeliri lex vetat. *Sic* decretum a Pontificum collegio non esse jus in loco publico fieri sepulcrum.' Cf. Marquardt, *Staatsverwaltung* iii. 309, and Bouché-Leclercq, *Les Pontifes*, p. 149.

accept them as conclusive without further evidence. Mr. Granger now adduces the *Lemuria* in May as confirming Servius, and quotes Ovid's description of the ejection of ghosts from the house by the aid of beans. But a little consideration will show that even this evidence is doubtful. It is by no means easy to determine what kind of a ghost was understood by the word *lemur*: but we have at any rate one clear definition by Porphyrion (on Horace Ep. ii. 209) viz. 'umbras vagantes *hominum ante diem mortuorum* atque ideo metuendas.' Cp. Nonius p. 125, who quotes Varro. On the whole the *lemures* would seem to be exceptional, unfortunate, and hostile ghosts, the spirits of men who had died a violent death, or were unburied: not the spirits of ancestors who had been buried in the proper way, and who were duly honoured at their graves during the Parentalia in February. I doubt in fact whether any amount of evidence for the practice of getting rid of ghosts from a house can be taken to prove that men were once buried there. All ghosts of course have a natural tendency to return to the house where they once lived in the flesh, and primitive man was much exercised to prevent their return. I cannot but agree with Marquardt (*Staatsverwaltung* iii. 309 note 1) that the statements of Servius and Isidorus are probably guesses suggested by the domestic worship of the Lares.

But this is a difficult matter, into which I cannot go further now. In conclusion, one word about 'suggrundarium.' What I objected to was Mr. Granger's statement, made without reservation, that down to late times children who died before the fortieth day were buried in niches under the eaves. What did he mean by late times? The time of Fulgentius? The matter is so obscure and so ill-attested that I should not like to hazard even a conjecture about it; and I think that both Professor Voigt and Mr. Granger would have done well to have left it alone.

W. Warde Fowler.

FRANCKEN'S *LUCAN*.

M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia. Cum commentario critico edidit C. M. Francken. Vol. I continens libros I—V. Lugduni Batavorum, apud A. W. Sijthoff. [1896]

The Introduction extends over xxxix pages, and contains a quantity of interesting matter. First comes an account of the work of the scholars who in the first half of last century, after the death of Nicolas Heinsius and Grotius, turned their attention to Lucan. These were Bentley, Burman, Oudendorp, Kortte (pp. i–iv). In the present century C. F. Weber (pp. iv, v) is the chief name till we come to the work of the new school, Steinhart, Usener, Genthe, and finally the recent edition of Hosius (pp. vii–x). Prof. Francken then gives his reasons for thinking that more yet remains to be done, and that the time has come when a critical commentary will be of use. Now that certain MSS are recognized as of preeminent merit among the crowd (about 150 are known in all), and now that we know something about the traditional text, criticism aided by interpretation is in its proper place and need be no longer delayed. The text of Hosius in fact cannot be regarded as final: an opinion which every student of Lucan's poem will probably share.

From this part of the Introduction, a most judicious piece of writing, the Editor passes to the MSS employed by him in the present work.

1. Of these the first is *Ashburnhamensis* [A], a ninth century MS now at Paris. The editor had previously treated of it in *Mnemosyne* (1891). It is now for the first time brought into line for critical purposes, and it is evident that the estimate of its importance given in a passing remark of Hosius (praef. p. xvi) would hardly satisfy Dr Francken.

2. *Bernensis* [B] of the tenth century, used by Hosius. The editor points out its very close agreement with A and gives instances shewing how it agrees with A as against M. He adds *haec omnia tam ad amussim conveniunt, ut alterum ex altero libro descriptum esse appareat*, and goes on to show that A is the earlier of the two. Prof. Francken therefore takes B for a copy of A, which is quite a new light on the subject.

3. *Montepessulanus* [M] of the tenth century. The editor agrees with Steinhart and Hosius in putting a very high value on this MS, and no more need be said here.

4. *Erlangensis* [E] of the tenth century, described and collated by A. Genthe (*C.R.* viii 371), now first used directly for the

critical treatment of the text. The editor admits the close agreement of this MS with AB and M. He does not however admit that it is a sister-copy of B, derived from the same original. Rather it must be classified as derived from the common archetype of ABM.

5. The *commentum Bernense* [C] edited by Usener. Of this and its value an admirable account is given.

6. *Vossianus secundus* [U] of the tenth century, long used by editors. The account of it here differs little from that of Hosius, and perhaps it may now be taken for granted that it is of a 'mixed' character, standing between the two chief classes of MSS represented by M and V.

7. *Vossianus primus* [V] of the tenth century, a celebrated MS, very finely executed. It is the chief representative of one of the classes of MSS. The description given of it is full and most interesting.

8. *Daventriensis* [D] of the fifteenth century, belonging to the V class. Not hitherto used, at least by modern editors.

9. *Bruxellensis* olim *Gemblacensis* [G] of the twelfth century (tenth according to Hosius), used by Hosius, who reckons it in the 'mixed' class. This our editor plainly denies. He says that G never sides with M against VU, it often agrees with V and sometimes with U. It agrees with AB more often than with M: hence he infers that AB are less pure representatives of their common archetype than M. Moreover G does not always agree with V: in fact it is not a copy of V, but comes from a common source. It is an inferior V.

10–13. *Taurinensis* [T], *Regius* [R], *Heinsianus*, and *Lipsiensis* [L], have been used to some extent, but not in complete collations.

After this (p. xxvi) Prof. Francken passes on to discuss the two Palimpsest fragments of MSS edited years ago by Detlefsen, the *Romanus* [P^R] and the *Vindobono-Neapolitanus* [P^v and P^n]. Of these P^R belongs to the same recension as V and supplies the inference, confirmed by a passage in Priscian, that this recension is as old as the fifth century or earlier. P^{vn} cannot be assigned to either class, but partake of both.

Next comes a brief treatment of the doubtful verses, strictly kept to the point, which is that the M class omit far more than do the V class. This is well known; but the editor is working up to a change of nomenclature, wishing to make it correspond with his view of facts. He rejects the names 'Pauline' and 'Non-Pauline,' urging that we really know nothing of the Paulus after whom these names are formed, that he was probably not a scholar or real editor but a mere collating scribe, and that we ought not to create a legend without authority. He classifies thus (i) *codices mutili*, the best of which are MABEU, and the class generally may be called μ. (ii) *codices vulgares*, the chief of which is V, and the general name ϕ. This, he argues, is a sounder nomenclature in the state of our knowledge: and it is not easy to dispute his conclusion.

On page xxxvii comes his *stemma codicum*, which naturally differs somewhat from that of Hosius.

It will be seen that this Introduction contains in its thirty eight pages much that is either new or regarded at least from new points of view. But it is when we turn to the text in detail that we find ourselves in the presence of the main body of novelties. These may be thus summarized.

(1) The record of the MSS readings is often very different from that given by Hosius of the same MSS. For instance the readings of M are differently described over and over again. This sometimes means that there is disagreement as to what M gives: at other times we have the same facts put from different points of view. Thus in iii 19 Hosius prints *rumpentis stamina*, noting 'rumpenti stamine M^1.' That is, he prints the actual reading of M, and gives in a note the original reading of M [M^1], as it was before correction. The method of notation is rather obscure. Francken prints *rumpentes stamina*, noting 'rumpentes stamina M.' That is, he also prints the text of M, but indicates that something different was written at first,—what, he does not say. This plan also has its drawbacks. We must observe that while Francken himself examined M [? in 1890], Hosius used the collation of Steinhart [? made in 1863]: Francken [p. viii.] says that Steinhart sometimes confused the readings of the earlier and later hands in M, but admits [p. xii] that the MS was in better condition at the time when the earlier collation was made. It will therefore not be easy to decide where the two accounts disagree.

(2) A great number of passages are subjected to emendation, and the conjectures adopted are largely those of Heinsius Bentley and the editor himself. Others of course come in for their share.

(3) The reasons given for preferring one MS reading to another, or an emendation to them all, are often in my opinion most unsatisfactory. Such phrases as *durum*,

minus aptum, non convenit, melius convenit, etc. are so frequent as to indicate a too subjective treatment of matters often delicate and difficult. Even when the great treasury of the Latin tongue has been produced by the united forces of Germany (which will take some time) we shall seldom be in a position to say positively that an author could not have written this or that, and therefore did not. Meanwhile here is a specimen of the kind of criticism that I utterly mistrust. In ii 128–9 *parvum sed fessa senectus sanguinis effudit iugulo* (So Hosius and MSS) the editor gives *paulum,* with this note: '*Paullum—sanguinis' pro inusitato 'parvum—sanguinis' Heinsius et sic malo credere Lucanum dixisse quam quod eius aetate inauditum fuit; nemo exemplum sufficiens attulit, cf. Heitland* CIII. Now the genitive after *parvum* may have been used colloquially long before we know of it: or it may be an innovation of Lucan's, for there must be a beginning to every change. Anyhow we cannot reject it without assuming that *paulum* was Lucan's word and that it was altered very early: for the corruption assumed extends to both families of MSS. And if this assumption be correct, what is the value of our excellent MSS authority after all? We may surely proceed to rewrite Lucan at our own sweet will. And this, I grieve to say, is just what Prof. Francken does.

I have said before, and say it again now, that, when a critic sits down to revise an author's text in the spirit of the schoolmaster looking over a pupil's exercise, he puts himself in a false position. He wants to improve what is before him; and, while teaching the reader what his author probably wrote, he is apt to teach his author what he ought to have written.

It is to be noted that of the three great conjectural correctors of Lucan—Heinsius, Bentley, Withof—not one produced an edition. For the Bentleian fragment is posthumous. I suspect that the pressure of editorial responsibility would have made a great difference to them, bringing them more into line with Oudendorp and Hosius.

To turn to details, we first notice that the MSS title *de bello civili,* restored by Hosius, is rejected and the conventional *Pharsalia* preferred. I search the critical note in vain for any justification of this. That ix 985, vi 313 will serve the purpose is in my view a mere delusion.

I now give a few instances to illustrate the notable difference in the accounts of MSS readings furnished by the two recent editors. Francken's version comes first, then that of Hosius in brackets.

I. 120 *permissum est. est* om VAMG, addit U [*est* add. FL]. BE are commonly included under A by Francken, so the difference here is simply in the report of U. For Hosius, in noting that two of his occasional MSS give *est,* clearly means that his regular MSS all omit it.

405 *nomine,* GM[M^1G]. Francken says that M has *nomine,* Hosius that it had *nomine* corrected afterwards to *numine.*

429 *sanguine* [*foedere*]. Here I cannot understand Francken's note, but I gather that on his shewing M^1 gives *sannine,* M *sanhine,* while *sanguine* and *foedere* are marginal readings [m]. Hosius says *foedere* MU et fortasse G^1. *sanguine* VB g and var lect. m [add E].

448 *dimittitis* VU [*demittitis* VB^1]. Here the reading of V is directly in dispute.

463 *crinigeros* AG [*cirrigeros* as an emendation only]. From Francken I infer that MVU have not *crinigeros;* from Hosius that they have. It can hardly be that Francken is only recording what is new [A's reading], for G is one of Hosius' regular MSS.

580 *et medio. e medio* A [*et medio* FL]. Here Francken seems to record A only.

604 *et tollens* VA (man 2 in marg. *attollens*) G [*attollensque* U]. From Hosius I gather that M has *et tollens,* from Francken nothing.

633 *viscera* [*pectora*]. According to Francken MG have *viscera,* V *pectora,* UA *pectore.* Hosius says that G has *viscera,* MB *pectore* [VU *pectora*].

642 *ulla sine* lege [*nulla cum*]. According to Francken VUEA have *nulla sine,* M *nulla cum* (but *cum* in ras.) Hosius says that MV have *nulla cum,* UBG *nulla sine.*

A curious instance is i. 254 where both editors read *ruentem,* but Francken cites it from G only, Hosius from VG. Francken distinctly says that V has *furentem.*

It is to be wished that editors who give readings of MSS would make it quite clear which collations were made by themselves and which not. I infer that Francken has used V and U himself, but I cannot find this directly stated. And on I 103 *mare* he cites VU for the variant *male* on the authority of Steinhart. This does not appear in Hosius. But on line 101 he cites the same MSS for the same variant on the same authority. This does appear in Hosius, who indeed accepts *male.* Can it be possible that there is some error

here? I fear there are slips. Thus on 453 we find '*datur* UMP.' But the editor has no codex P, for the palimpsest fragments P^{v} P^{n} P^{R} include no part of the first book.

The following are a number of passages which it is not possible or desirable to discuss here at length, in which it appears to me that Hosius' text is to be preferred. I give the new editor's reading first, then that of Hosius in brackets, indicating briefly the MS authority for each.

I. 26 nulloque domus custode *tenentur* ABEG^{1}C, [*tenetur* MVUG]. 54 *mergitur* T and Grotius^{1}, [*vergitur* MABEVUG and Priscian]. 305 *valido* UGmb, [*validae* MVABE]. 315 *sociabunt* G^{1}, [*satiabunt* MABEVUG]. 341 non *me* duce VU, [*cum* MABEGTL]. 405 *nomine* M^{1}G, [*numine* MABEVU]. 475 *adserat* V (*asserat*), [*adferat* MABE, *afferat* UG]. 507 *conciperet* D and a Berlin MS (Hosius' D), [*conciperent* all best MSS]. 534 *e* partibus ABEVUG, [*de* M]. 614 vulnere *laxo* VU m GC, [*largo* MABE]. 615 diffusum *est* U, [*est* om MABEVG]. 667 confundet ius omne *manus* EC, [*manu* MABVUG]. 688 *et super* is var. lect. in g, [*desuper* all best MSS]. 695 *defecta* AKg, [*deserta* MBE VUG].

In a poem left unfinished it is but natural that there should be weak places. In particular, weak lines and defects of *iunctura* need not surprise us. Therefore I cannot approve the bracketing of such lines as

I. 188
turrigero canos effundens vertice crinis
[MSS and Servius ad Aen.]

282
par labor atque metus pretio maiore petuntur.

620
plurimus adspero variabat sanguine livor.

There is no reason whatever for suspecting these. Nor ought 424–5 *optimus excusso . . . Sequana frenis* to be doubted to the point of bracketing, though they come in a passage specially liable to interpolation. On the other hand the wretched lines 436–40 *Pictones . . . alis* have long been known to be spurious, and Francken after W. E. Weber rightly ejects them. They have no more business in the text than 423a *et Lemovix audax nimium levitate movetur* and 426a *quamvis non parva retinens sui pectoris arma*, which C. F. Weber rightly rejected. The wonder is that they were ever printed in any text.

Emendations are sometimes necessary; now and then they are even successfully achieved. But they commonly break down in one (or both) of two ways: either the necessity of some change is not proved, or the proposed change is at least no improvement. When an editor ventures to introduce a change into his text, he challenges free criticism: and I shall be surprised if scholars in general accept many of the changes made by Prof. Francken. I give his text first, then that of the MSS.

I. 16 quaque dies medius flagrantibus aestuat *auris* [*horis*]. Bentley's *auris* is adopted, but not for Bentley's reason. Yet 'pleonasmus non ferendus' is surely no reason for the change in Lucan; and that *aura* and *hora* may be confused is of interest only when a change is needed. For *horis* see Horace *carm.* iii. 13, 2 flagrantis atrox *hora* Caniculae. Render 'where the land of the noonday sun swelters in its seasons of broiling heat'. In 414 below it appears that A gives *oris*. But the error is well known.

102 nec patitur conferre *gradum* [*fretum*]. Either editors one after another have lost their heads over this passage, or I am dreaming. To me '*fretum* ferri non potest' is a sorry piece of dogmatism. As *conferre gradum* or *manum* could be said of two men, so *conferre fretum* of two isthmus-bursting seas. But, it is said, then it should be *freta*. Perhaps it might be. But it may be noted that we have above *geminum mare*, not *duo maria*, also that *fretum* is a noun of multitude = *aquas*, *undas* &c. *Conferre gradum* is said of two men meeting face to face with their swords: *conferre fretum* is a figurative application, used of two seas meeting face to face with their waters. It is a fancy; the fact we have in the case of the Strait of Messina in ii. 437 *postquam gemino tellus elisa profundo est*. There too both seas have acted, each from its own side. Yet in 435–6 above this common action is thus described, *donec confinia pontus solveret incumbens*, where *pontus* = *undae*, *fretum*.

115–6 tu sola *furentis* inde virum poteras atque hinc retinere parentem [*furentem*]. This easy change, proposed by Heins Bentley and Kortte, must have suggested itself to many other readers. The nearness of *furentem*, and our old friend the scribe's eye, seem to settle the matter. Yet the corruption, if such it be, is very old, and the more I look at it the more I doubt whether the singular does not give a rather better shade of meaning. Julia's likeness to the Sabine women is in the result that would have followed her mediation. She would not rush between a father and a husband in

arms, but hold them back one by one, work on their feelings separately. Thus *furentem* would be better. That Lucan does not object to the assonance of endings every reader knows.

119 morte tua *discissa* fides [*discussa*]. An atrocious change, missing the point of the metaphor, as Bentley did at times. The metaphor inverts that of the arch, for *discussa* is just *collapsa* turned the other way. As the withdrawal of a keystone sends the fabric down in a heap, so the withdrawal of a tie lets it fall helplessly in all directions. Why then not *dilapsa*? Surely because this word is commonly used of gentle or gradual dispersion or decay, and what he wants to convey is a notion of instant ruin. The moment Julia died, the *fides* fell to pieces. That *dilabi* is a rarer word in Lucan we may let pass.

138–9 nec iam validis radicibus haerens, pondere fixa *suo*, nudosque . . . . etc [*suo est*, and no comma at *haerens*]. This is the editor's own. And yet, by making the clause with *fixa* a mere participial echo of the preceding, the whole result is summed up up in *trunco non frondibus efficit umbram* below. But the words *nudosque per aera ramos effundens* lead us up to this: and so does the weakness of the root-hold lead us to the statement that the tree is held up solely or mainly by its own weight. This part of the picture is brought out more clearly by the preceding detail; for the votive offerings hung upon the tree enhance its dignity and will share its fall.

186 *lugens* visa duci patriae trepidantis imago [*ingens*]. Why the conjecture of Heins is preferred, I cannot see. It thrusts upon Lucan a wretched tautology, for we have *maestissima* in 187 and the further context to boot; '*ingens* fere de rebus turpibus, nimis magnis' says the editor. How about ii. 730 *ingens exul* (Pompey), Hor. epist ii. 1, 6 *ingentia facta*, and *ingens gloria, fama, Aeneas*, in Vergil? The truth rather is that *ingens* takes colour from its context, and it is not strange that the colour is often an ugly one. Here is merely means that the figure was of superhuman size, and hence the more impressive.

260 *mersus*que iacet sine murmure Pontus [*medius*]. No doubt *medius* is difficult, and the two words are confused in the MSS at iv. 745. But here there is no disagreement, and in iv. 745 the editor prefers *medios* to *mersos*. Even Damsté's *mutus* does not satisfy me here. And does *medius pontus* mean any more than 'the open expanse of sea'? True, the transition from *rura silent* preceding is abrupt, but in the writing of a youth this is not strange. And *medius* is very common in this sense in Lucan. See ii. 665 *medias . . . . in undas*, iii. 2 *medium . . . . profundum*, and many more where the expanse is of land.

262–3 ecce faces *bello, dubiasque* in proelia *mentis* urguentis addunt stimulos . . . . fata [*belli dubiaeque . . . . menti*]. Here *bello* is from Bentley, and is clever, though hardly necessary. The other correction is adopted because the singular *menti* and *urguentis* used absolutely will not do For the former see iv. 704 *variam semper dant otia mentem*, referring to *miles* preceding = the soldier, the soldiery, not a particular individual, vii. 183 *mentisque tumultu* of the same men to whom *mentibus* is applied in 180 above. For the rest, hear Oudendorp's Scholiast 'ordo est, ecce fata addunt dubiae menti faces belli, et addunt stimulos urgentes in proelia.' Surely better than emendation.

291–5

> sic postquam fatus, et ipsi
> in bellum prono, tantum tamen addidit irae
> accenditque *duci*, quantum clamore iuvatur
> Eleus sonipes, quamvis iam carcere *clausus*
> inmineat foribus, pronusque repagula laxet.

[*ducem* and *clauso*]. Bentley proposed *facem* and other changes to suit. To me *ducem* seems better than *duci*, for we have a pleonasm in any case, and the two verbs with *tantum irae* are in my opinion the more awkward expression. The comma at *prono* is quite needless. And *clauso* I also prefer to *clausus*. For it is a mere ablative of place, and there is no need to cut off *carcere clauso* by commas, as if it were an ablative absolute. I am glad to see that the editor rejects Hosius' *pedibus* for *pronus* in the last line.

316 ille *roget* currus nondum patientibus annis? [*reget*. some MSS having *regit*]. The complaint against *reget* is that it is in bad taste, 'questus est pusionis invidi vulgaris.' Even if this be a fair statement—which I doubt—, I reply that much of Lucan's rhetoric is in bad taste, for instance, most of this very speech, which is not in character with Caesar at all. Perhaps viii. 85 is in itself worse, though it may possibly be more in character with the speaker, his darling Pompey.

333 quem *tandem* inveniet tam longa potentia finem? [*tamen*]. This is one of Bentley's hasty changes. But we may observe that 327–31 are a simile, 331–2 a gnomic application of this. Looking then to 325–6, we find a reference to Sulla as

Pompey's master in the evil trade of civil war and so forth. Now Sulla *invenit finem* by his retirement. The force of *tamen* is then 'But after all' [Sulla retired, and why will not you?] Hence in 334–5 we return to this point, *ex hoc iam te, inprobe, regno ille tuus saltem doceat descendere Sulla.*

340 *paruerit* [*paruerim*]. To catch at a marginal note of a corrector of A (a), in order to avoid the change to the first person, is 'improvement' with a vengeance. I have always thought the change of person vigorous and good, and think so still. I cannot believe it to be the work of the early scribes.

342 miles sub *quo iubet* iste triumphet [*quolibet*]. This emendation is resorted to because Caesar, addressing his men face to face, could not venture to speak of them with contempt, and therefore *iste* cannot agree with *miles* in the common sense, of *miles meus.* I reply that the use of *iste* = *hic* or *meus* in Lucan often leaves contempt very far to seek. Haskins cites v. 351–2 *sunt ista profecto curae castra deis;* even better is iii. 125–6 *certe violata potestas invenit ista deos,* where the tribune has no mind to disparage his official character.

372 iussa sequi tam posse *iuvat* quam velle necesse est [*mihi*]. Here the suggestion of Withof is followed. Most editors find a difficulty in applying *necessest* to *posse,* and it is true that *mihi* may have crept in from a note. Very early, however; for both families of MSS are involved. To prove, as Withof does, that *iuvat* is a good and common antithesis to *necesse est* is nothing: who doubts it? Perhaps Lucan may not have wanted it here. The centurion is under constraint; he cannot say *non possum,* in the face of his previous exploits: he cannot say *non volo,* for he has gone too far to turn back. Thus in vii. 260–3 Caesar urges on his men by pointing out that treason will be swallowed up in victory. And in that very speech he is clearly looking back both to his own speech i. 299—351 and this of the centurion. Surely the case for emendation here is not yet made out.

407–8 solus sua littora turbat Circius, et tuta prohibet statione *Monoecum* [*Monoeci*]. The editor explains his text thus, 'facit ut deus tutam stationem non habeat aut nautis offerat.' The god then wants the roadstead not for himself but for seafarers, and this W.N.W. wind *prohibet quominus stationem habeat aut praebeat nautis.* It may be that this comes fairly out of the new text, but I doubt it. It seems to me that *prohibet* more naturally refers to those debarred from an advantage, *prohibet nautas quominus utantur.* The only similar passage I know in Lucan is vi. 503 (of the moon) *si fraterna prohiberet imagine tellus,* 'if the earth were debarring her from reflecting the sun's light,' *quominus solis lumine uteretur.* In fact A prevents B from enjoying C, not C from helping B. Therefore I would rather abide by the old interpretation, understanding an object *nautas,* than alter the old text. But this is harsh, I grant. If we must emend, what a glorious case of a note that has crept into the text is here! *Monoeci* is not wanted to localise the phenomena, for we have *sub Herculeo sacratus nomine* [*numine*] *portus* just above. Then it is a scholion on *statione,* and has taken the place of the object-accusative, say *carinas, petentis,* or the like. So much for a conjecture. I should remark that the details of the winds in this passage present great difficulty.

426 et docilis rector *constrati* Belga covinni [*monstrati*]. *constrati* is from Heinsius, and Curtius ix. 10 § 25 is cited in support; but there the chariots seem to be *constrati* for a special purpose only. Whether Lucan wrote *monstrati* meaning 'a vehicle adopted from abroad' may fairly be doubted: that he wrote *constrati* there is no reason whatever for believing.

432 *quos Sulga* pererrat gurgite [*qua Cinga*]. This is Bentley's correction. As to the name of the river I will say nothing, for I can offer no solution of the difficulties. But *quos* rests on the assumption that '*pererrare* absolute dici non potest.' Is this so certain? Let us look at some neuter verbs, compounds of *per.* In viii. 664 *permansisse* the noble expression of Pompey's face 'lasted through' the death-struggle and remained in death. Very similar are the uses of *perstat perstant* &c. iii. 620, iv. 30, v. 210, vii. 690. For *permanere, perdurare, perequitare,* see the dictionaries. Add Horace epist. i. 17, 38 *qui pervenit, fecitne viriliter?* See too Silius v. 391 *pervasit,* viii. 430 *perstrepit,* xi. 288 *personat,* xv. 143 *perlabi* [connected loosely with a *qua* preceding], and note *oberrare* used in *Persius* vi. 32. Above all Fronto (p. 196 Naber) *ut rectam ingressis viam certus itineris est finis ac modus, errantibus autem peragrare facilius est quam pervenire,* illustrated by p. 204 (of nomads) *non ad locum sed ad vesperum contenditur.* I venture therefore to keep *qua* and render 'there is relief too [see 422] in the lands where Cinga (or Sulga) goes his wandering way, where Rhone.' . . . . &c.

453–4 nemora alta, *remotos* incolitis *lucos* [*remotis . . . lucis* and no comma]. Here Bentley is followed because *nemora non sunt pars lucorum.* So that when the correction is made we are still left with a wretched tautology, for *remotos* is not really different from *altos;* 'the depths of the groves' will do for the whole. If we say that *lucus* is more particularly a sacred grove, we remove the tautology but make the ablative of place tolerable. 'Ye dwell in the depth of woodlands among the retired sacred groves,' that is, in the retirement of the sacred groves. If the ablatives are corrupt, the corruption is very old. 'Corruptio in fine versus et simili exitu in proximo vocabulo facile intelligitur' says the editor. Does this mean that the neighbourhood of *incolitis* has affected the other two words? If so, it is not easy to believe.

461 animaeque *rapaces* mortis [*capaces*]. The text is due to Heins. Against Haskins' rendering 'great enough for death' it is said 'sed qui mortem timet etiam notionem mortis animo continet.' I take this to imply that *capaces* means 'containing a notion of death.' Surely it means 'able to contain or receive death.' = ready for death. Compare 511–3 *urbem . . . generis . . capacem . . . humani,* x. 182–3 *quis dignior umquam hoc fuit auditu mundique capacior hospes?* It is also I believe true that Lucan does not elsewhere use *rapax* with a genitive. The MSS reading should be kept.

463 *cirrigeros* [*crinigeros*]. Text after Lipsius, because, says that great scholar, all men *crinem gerunt.* Surely this is not enough to condemn the word. If you say that a man *crinem gerit,* you call attention to a particular circumstance, thus laying stress on it. Hence such forms as *crinitus.*

486–8 nec solum volgus inani percussum terrore pavet, sed curia et *ipsa;* sedibus exiliere patres [*ipsi* sedibus, with no stop]. No justification is given for this wanton change, and I see none.

491 *urguent,* [*urguet*]. This is hardly worth discussing, and I suspect the comma is a misprint.

536 *discurrere* [*decurrere*]. Why this change? In 643 *incerto discurrunt sidera motu* is a hypothesis at once rejected. Here we want a word meaning 'run their normal course,' and *decurrere* is the right word. Compare Manilius i 503 [505], where Orion is said *toto semper decurrere mundo,* and Pompon Mela i. 1 *unde sol oritur oriens nuncupatur aut ortus, quo demergitur occidens vel occasus, qua decurrit meridies, ab adversa parte septentrio.*

544 noctem *induxere* Mycenae [*duxere*]. The meaning of *duxere* is that Mycenae 'took on itself' the darkness of night, that is, was suddenly veiled in gloon. To Haskins' note on vi. 828 *caelo lucis ducente colorem* add Stat. Ach. ii. 21 (307) *ducere nubes.* The MSS reading is far the better.

555 summumque *inpellit* Atlanta [*inplevit*]. This is a fragment of one of Bentley's wildest reconstructions. Why the editor adopts it is not explained in the note, and I cannot tell. Surely *inplevit* = 'rose to the top of,' like *fossas inplere* = 'fill the ditches to the brim.'

600 et lotam parvo *renovant* Almone Cybeben [*revocant*]. This is Burman's conjecture. I had guessed the same, but gave it up on finding that the word *revocare* undoubtedly occurs in the sense of 'refresh' 'renew' in Silius iv. 15 *revocantque nova fornace bipennis.* It is proposed to emend that passage also, but Bauer rightly keeps the word. There are plenty of passages in good writers where the sense comes very near 'renew' 'restore.' See Verg. Aen. i. 235 *revocato a sanguine Teucri,* georg. iv. 282. With these compare *Aen.* i. 214 *victu revocant vires.* For the matter see Silius viii. 363 *tepidoque fovent Almone Cybelen.*

607 et *terra* maesto cum murmure condit [*terrae*]. This is due to Kortte. I see no reason for leaving the MSS, and the instances given in Haskins' note seem to me enough to establish the dative construction.

630 *haec* ubi concepit magnorum *feta* malorum [*his..fata*]. This is from Bentley. No instance of *fetus* with genitive is given by him. Dictionaries supply one from Claudian (bell Goth. 25-6) which seems doubtful to me. I take *fata malorum* = the destiny that brings or imposes great calamities. Not unlike is ii. 65 *gravis vivacia fata senectae,* the doom of long life that brings a burdensome old age. That *his* is both pointed and correct I have no doubt.

637–8 *flexis* sic omina Tuscus involvens multaque tegens ambage canebat [*flexa*]. That *flexa* carried on with *involvens* to *ambage* is ugly, I freely admit. That *flexis* became *flexa* by assimilation to *omina* is a pretty and possible assumption. But both families of MSS are involved. I had rather not meddle with the passage without a stronger reason than I can find at present.

656 toto *furerent* incendia mundo [*fluerent*]. The MSS text is here rejected because *fluere* is not in keeping with *incendia.* Now *fluere* and related words

supply a great number of various metaphors, while *ignis* etc. create a great demand for them. Fire *serpit, pascitur, scandit, vorat, lambit, currit*, and so forth. Thus I do not wonder to find in Silius xvii. 98 *ex omni manant incendia tecto*, 101 *fluit undique victor Mulciber*, 103 *exundat pestis*, xiv. 311 *exundante vapore*, or of the bull in Val. F vii. 572 *atro volvens incendia fluctu*, though this last is bracketed by Schenkl. To suppose that *furerent* became *furent* or *fuerent* and was corrected into *fluerent* is ingenious, but unwarranted and quite unnecessary.

I may seem to be blindly devoted to the traditional MSS text and to ignore the necessity for emendation that now and then undoubtedly exists. Let me point out what the state of affairs really is with regard to Lucan. We have a great number of MSS, some of which are confessedly good, that is, afford a better authority for the text than do the MSS of most writers. Two families of MSS are recognized, (1) the V family, the non-Pauline or *vulgares codices*, (2) the M family, the Pauline or *mutili codices*. It is agreed that the V recension dates back to before the fifth century. That the M recension is very old is not disputed, though details are: in any case a good and ancient ancestor is assumed, however far back. That copies of Lucan varying greatly in care and correctness were current shortly after his death is attested by the Suetonian life. What then is the case against a reading in which both families of MSS agree? It seems to me that the arguments from within must be perfectly overwhelming to justify emendation on the score of necessity. As for arguments from outside, accounting for the assumed blunder, we must be very careful how we let ourselves be carried away even by the most ingenious and learned palaeographers. We are not dealing with the errors of the slumberous but diligent monk, but with those of the trained copyist of a much earlier time; errors transmitted to us by two separate lines of tradition. Once we are convinced that there is an error of this kind before us, we have to explain its existence by hypotheses built up on hypotheses, with the chance that at any given moment we may have lost the clue, if indeed we ever had it. Is not it clear that we are in a position where the forces of obstruction must and should prevail: where readiness to emend betrays a misapprehension of editorial duty?

I maintain, therefore, that in the present state of our knowledge we are not entitled to set aside the concurrent tradition of both families of MSS, provided that a fairly intelligible meaning can be got out of the text. However much we may seem to improve it by a change, however certain it may be that the proposed change is palaeographically possible, we have no business with change in cases of this kind. However much we may respect the veteran scholar who edits Lucan, we must never forget that the poem before us is the work of an immature genius, and was confessedly transmitted to later times in an unfinished state. What editing may have gone on soon after the author's death, we do not know. We do know that it is risky to correct tradition by guesswork. If the agreement of the MSS is not to be trusted, what is? Every word of the poem may be called in question: and, when the MSS differ, why should we prefer one to another? If conjecture is our habitual remedy against their agreement, much more may we trust in it against their disagreement. On pp. xxvii-xxviii of Hosius' preface are some admirable remarks: it is only to be regretted that in practice he now and then abandoned his own sound principles. Prof. Francken is not inconsistent with himself [pref. pp. viii, ix], so far as I understand his somewhat obscure words. One function of his edition was to be this, 'ut ex inventis Grotii, Heinsii, Bentleii, aliorum caute optima quaeque reciperentur, et ex eorum ingeniis aliquod lucrum in verba poetae redundaret.' And my opinion of the result is that in applying this process to Lucan the 'poet's words' seldom gain, while there is nothing to show that the poet does not lose. As Lucan said of Sulla ii. 140-3,

Ille quod exiguum restabat sanguinis urbi
hausit: dumque nimis iam putria membra recidit,
excessit medicina modum, nimiumque secuta est,
qua morbi duxere, manus.

But, alas, I find this emended also. Aug. *civ. dei* iii. 27 has *manum*, quoting the lines. After the instances I have given above, the reader will not wonder that *manum* is adopted, against the MSS of Lucan.

Transposition of lines is a favourite form of emendation with some editors. That lines may have got out of place is not to be denied. But it is true also that different minds will often prefer different sequences of notions, and very great caution is needed in transpositions carried out in defiance of MSS tradition. If any reader of Lucan

will look at i. 324–6, I shall be surprised if he approves Francken's putting 326 before 325. The reason given seems to me absurdly inadequate. And the further change of order in 326 (putting *scelerum* before *Syllam* in order to make it go with *docilis*) is an equally wanton disturbance.

On the other hand the editor keeps *motus* and *monitus* in i. 587–8, where I believe that Graevius Heins Burman and Schrader rightly transpose the words, and where a slip of eye and pen was so very easy. However, he may be right. His note on the clever conjecture *fulminis edoctus mentem* &c. is amusing, for we are told that Bentley was 'ut saepius, ornare potius quam emendare studens.' Which recalls to mind two famous lines of Burns.

There are many lines in Lucan where the order of words is differently given in different MSS But i. 160, 589, are not instances of this, and Hosius rightly keeps the traditional order. But in 583 Francken is very likely right in reading *fracto Marium* with VG, for the other order is surely worse.

There are of course a number of passages where the MSS readings differ, where either reading makes sense, and where a final decision satisfactory to all scholars is perhaps not to be looked for. Here are a few passages where Hosius and Francken disagree, and where it is hard indeed to decide between them. Francken's reading is given first, and the MSS authority is appended to each.

I. 37 *ipsa* VUB^{1}G^1(AE), *ista* M. 103 *frangat* VAm C(BE), *franget* MUGT. 209 *iubam et vasto grave murmur* AGm (B^{1}E), *iubas et vasto murmur* MVU. 453 *datur* MU, *datum* Gm [*datum est* VABEgT]. 531 *denso* Gm (and V acc to Hosius), *tenso* UCA(BE)v g (and M, but *in rasura* acc to Francken). 646 *an tollet* VUG, *attollet* A (B and *in ras* E) M (*in ras* acc to Francken).

In some passages where the two editors agree I still have doubts: here are some. Their text is given first.

I. 320 *micantes* A(BE)mu, *minantes* M VUGb, 588 *errantis* VUGmb, *volitantis* MA (BE) u g. 687 *Enyo* Vc, *Erinys* (in various spellings) MABEUGv.

Questions of orthography are the plague of editors of Latin texts. Prof. Francken's rule is [Intr. pp. xxxvi. foll.] to note the instances where MSS preserve archaic spelling, whether this be accepted in the text or not. He himself uses a varying spelling, but gives no clear account of the method by which it is arrived at. Hosius [praef. pp. xxiv. xxv.) on the contrary leaves no doubt as to his procedure. Our editor however points out that the palimpsest fragments confirm his spelling in various points, though they are too meagre to furnish a standard. For instance *harena*. Why *arena* should nevertheless occur in the text [cf. i. 368, 685] is a natural question. The wording of this part of the introduction is certainly obscure. I will only note in the text *cespes, cohercere, limphatus, circuire, Tibris, exiliere* (488), and *maenia*. The last seems to be the cause of the misprint *manibus* (571). I should add that misprints are rare in this book.

Punctuation is a matter on which there are and will be wide differences of opinion. As instances of innovations in which I cannot agree it will be enough to refer to i. 126, 311, 520, 648.

I have not dealt with the details of books ii.–v., for my main object is to exhibit the freedom with which the editor has treated the MSS tradition whenever he finds cause of offence in the traditional text. With the utmost respect for him as a scholar, I must submit that his procedure is wholly inadmissible. To multiply details would serve no good purpose. If my principles are shown to be wrong I shall gladly welcome the exposure: meanwhile I have said enough to raise a serious and definite issue.

The photographic specimens of the codices A M V are interesting. I only hope that the second volume will contain a specimen of U. Of the printing &c. it need only be said that the book is produced in a style worthy of the traditions of the Dutch press.

W. E. Heitland.

LAFAYE'S NOTES ON *STATIUS SILV. I.* AND KLOTZ, *CURAE STATIANAE.*

Quelques notes sur les Silvae de Stace, premier livre, par G. Lafaye. Paris, Klinksieck. 1896. Fr. 2.50. *Curae Statianae.* Dissertatio inauguralis. Scripsit A. Klotz. Leipzig. 1896. 1 Mk. 20.

These two pamphlets are the latest contribution I have seen in book-form to the literature, every year increasing, of the Silvae of Statius. The list of works on this subject which Lafaye marshals on the two

first pages of his little volume, nearly all fall within the last thirty years; during which these poems have been examined, especially by German scholars, with a new minuteness, generally resulting in articles, dissertations, or separate editions of some particular *Silva*. I miss however in this list the valuable dissertations of two Scandinavian philologists, Sandström and Lundström; the latter, especially, ought to have been included, full as he is of suggestive and bright remarks. Englishmen have particular cause to be interested in this return to an author on whom the eminent Cambridge scholar Markland lavished his erudition in an edition (1728) reprinted by Sillig early in the present century (1827). The work of Markland will remain a monument of the learning of his time; but the discovery of the Madrid MS., the best representative of that which Poggio found early in the fifteenth century at S. Gall, and the vastly increased materials now at our disposal for illustrating the manners and morals of the Romans under Domitian, make a new edition of the *Silvae* much desired, and it may confidently be expected not only that the text of the poems will soon appear in a critically much improved shape, but also that a new and enlarged exegesis will be brought to bear on the countless difficulties of allusion, whether to contemporary history, out of the way mythological legends, or facts of Roman every-day life, with which they abound.

M. Lafaye's notes extend to Bk. i. alone. Their strong point is the archaeological detail by which the author supports, sometimes the MS. text, sometimes a particular emendation. Such is the discussion by which he defends, with O. Müller, Stange and McNaghten, the emendation of Markland in i. 37.

Dextra uetat pugnas: laeuam Tritonia virgo
Non grauat.

Where the MS. reading is *pugnes lauium* corrected by Bährens to *pugnis Latium*. The left hand of the statue of Domitian, it has been argued, would naturally hold the reins; how then could it hold the image of Minerva? The poem gives no hint of a lorica, on which the figure might have been worked. M. Lafaye finds an explanation in an equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius (Fig. 1, p. 11) in which the right hand is extended, as a symbol of peace and protection (Quintil. *Inst.* xi. 3, 119), while the left hand has the palm turned upwards and seems to have held originally a statue, possibly of Victory (there is no trace of reins); again in two equestrian statues figured on coins, in each of which the left hand is similarly employed in holding a small figure. This seems plausible enough, and the figure of Aurelius suggests a sufficiently close interpretation of the poet's words (i. 2) *Stat Latium complexa forum;* but the strangeness of the corruption *lauium* for *laeuam* still remains to vex the palaeographical sense and keep the matter uncertain.

ii. 4–6.

Demigrant Helicone deae, quatiuntque nouena
Lampade sollennem thalamis coeuntibus ignem,
Et de Pieriis uocalem fontibus undam.

Lafaye shows that there is here an allusion to the actual ceremony with which the bridegroom received the bride, *aqua et igni*, both together holding a torch and a water jar. This function is here transferred to the Muses. It is however remarkable that the Muses do not ordinarily (Lafaye says never) hold torches; Statius perhaps knew that they possessed a sacred wood on Helicon (Paus. ix. 28-31) and represented them as carrying torches cut from this hallowed spot to give a joyous augury to the marriage of Stella.

I hardly know what to say of the explanation offered of the difficult words (iii. 32)

Sic Chalcida fluctus
Expellunt fluuii

'l'Euripe repousse Chalcis, qui s'avance (*ἀκτὴν προβλῆτα* Ion dans Strab. i. 3, 19) comme si elle s'efforçait de rejoindre le continent tant voisin qu'elle regrette,' that is to say the advance which the land makes at Chalcis towards the opposite shore of Boeotia is repelled by the strong flow of the Euripus. Possible; but what shall we make of *fluuii*?

Even more doubtful is the view (p. 34) taken of the words

damnosaque fila senectae
Exuit

where *fila*, which Markland explained of the *slough* which a serpent casts, is supposed by Lafaye to refer to the threads in which spiders enmesh their insect prey. He finds a similar allusion in Juvenal's well known (ix. 128) *obrepit non intellecta senectus* and in another passage of the *Silvae* (V. iii. 258)

nec segnis tabe senili
Exitus instanti praemisit membra sepulchro.

It seems doubtful whether either a slough or a spider's thread was in the poet's thoughts; or even, again, the threads of the Fates (Stephens, 1651) with which, spite of *vv.* 123-4, *exuit* hardly agrees. May not *fila* refer to the texture or fibres of the body, which, as old age approaches, alter and suffer deterioration? cf. *defloccati senes.*

Most valuable are the historical notes on *vv.* 13 and 80 of this *Silva.* The only thing which I regret is, that the African inscription quoted from Cagnat is not printed *in extenso.* But I would object that in *v.* 102 the words

quoque anguis abundat
Spumatu

are *not* confined to the trained serpents which we know to have formed part of the therapeutic apparatus at the Asklepieion of Epidaurus, but are, as Rinn thought, and most readers of the whole passage would, I think, infer, general.

The note on v. 27

praecelsis quarum vaga molibus
Crescit [unda

is a very good specimen of Lafaye's vindication of MSS. against unnecessary correction. Markland conjectured *cessit,* but the passage from Frontinus *de Aquaed.* is quite enough to prove that *crescit* is right; the words *adquisitionibus, adquisitionum* are in effect only another way of expressing the same idea.

I am less satisfied with the discussion on the much-vexed (vi. 15)

Et quod percoquit †Ebosia cannos†

and cannot bring myself to believe that *Ēbosĭa* as representing *Ebusus* could be admitted by so careful a metrist as Statius. As I suggested in the *Journal of Philology*[1] (v. p. 203) it seems probable that the sugar-cane is alluded to; *Ebosia* I suppose to be a corruption of *arbor Inda; arbor* first became *aebos,* then *ebos.* The form *Indus* as adjective occurs S. II. i. 160 *quod munera graminis Indi,* III. iii. 94 *Indi dentis honos.* The sugar-cane was called by the Romans the Indian tree or Indian reed (see *J. of Phil.* v. pp. 262, 3).

[1] Of my three articles in the *Cambridge Journal of Philology* on the *Silvae,* M. Lafaye only mentions one (vol. xiii. p. 88) in his list; the latest is in vol. xx. p. 17 'An Oxford MS. of Statius' *Silvae.*'

ii. 235–6.
Omnis plebeio teritur praetexta tumultu
Hinc eques hinc iuuenum †questus stola mixta laborat.

Lafaye ingeniously suggests for *questus -que aestus,* comparing the use of *unda* and *aestuare* of a crowd. (The passage he cites from Luer. vi. 1261 can hardly be so explained; to my mind Munro is quite convincing in supposing *aestus* to refer to the heat which was one of the chief causes of the plague raging.) This conjecture however draws with it a further change of *Hinc eques hinc* to *Hinc equitum,* which seems improbable.

iv. 62.
hunc mecum Epidauria
Hinc alti gaudens [proles

Lafaye very cleverly
hinc mecum Epidauria
Inquit abi gaudens. [proles

He compares Theb. iii. 229 *Talis mihi nate per Argos Talis abi,* and for *inquit* at the beginning of the verse Theb. v. 157.

v. 36–9.
Sola nitet flauis Nomadum decisa metallis
Purpura, sola cauo Phrygiae quam Synnados antro
Ipse cruentauit maculis liuentibus Attis
†Quoque Tyri niueas secat et Sidonia rupes.

Lafaye conjectures

Quasque Tyrus niueas secuit Sidonia rupes.

He rightly observes that Prudentius seems to be imitating Statius in Contra Symm. ii. 246–7

Et quae saxa Paros secat et quae Punica rupes
Quae uiridis Lacedaemon habet maculosaque Synnas

though in Prudentius *rupes* must be nominative; in Statius it certainly seems to be accusative.

I think *Quoque* must be *Quotque,* would retain *Tyri,* and treat *et* as the vitiated word, perhaps a substitute for *arx.* At any rate *secat,* which Prudentius also has, commends itself as probable 'and all the white rocks which Tyre's Sidonian stronghold cuts into blocks.'

I cannot agree with the view (p. 69) that in vi. 37-40 *alis* is addressed to Domitian, and that *beate* ought to be *beati*. It is true that this makes it possible to retain *nescit* in 40 but at a cost which makes it not worth while. After the general public addressed in *putes* 34, a distinct vocative is called for: that vocative is, if MSS. are right, *annona* and it follows that *nescit* is a mistake for *nescis*.

The *Curae Statianae* of A. Klotz mainly consists of an edition of *Silv.* ii. 2, with additional remarks on other crucial passages of the *Silvae*. The author, a native of Zittau in Saxony, is indebted to his fellow townsman M. Moritz Krohn, whose forthcoming edition will exhibit for the first time a collation of the Madrid MS. (M) now believed to be the earliest, for a complete conspectus of M's readings in ii. 2, and for new conjectures on this poem. He has besides given a full commentary on it, a careful perusal of which enables me to pronounce it useful—among other reasons, for recalling attention to the almost forgotten edition of Ferd. Morell, Paris 1602. Among the more interesting views I note Beloch's identification of Megalia *v.* 80 with the Neapolitan Castel del Uovo, the minute description of the various marbles mentioned in 86-93, the identification of the name of Pollius, owner of the villa at Surrentum, with the still surviving Marino di Paolo. Many of the discussions, too, of passages in other parts of the *Silvae* are suggestive.

On the following points I doubt:—

(1) Klotz (with De Vit in the excellent *Onomasticon*, which forms the last portion of his edition of Forcellini's *Lexicon*, interrupted alas! by the author's death at the end of O) considers the *Mygdonius senex* who is combined with Nestor in 108 to be Tithonus; and no doubt *Mygdoniis cubilibus* in Theb. ii. 134 is the couch of Tithonus, and Tithonus is distinctly combined with Nestor as a type of prolonged old age in S. IV. iii. 150. But in Theb. v. 751-2 *Pyliae nec fata senectae Maluerit Phrygiis aut degere longius annis* Lactantius explains the 'Phrygian years' of Priam, adding only as a view of others (*alii*) that Tithonus may be meant. In I. iv. 125 *tu Troica dignus Saecula et Euboici transcendere pulveris annos, Nestoreosque situs*, where the Sybil and Nestor are combined with the *Troica saecula*, the question is much the same. Tithonus would suit with the Sybil better, Priam, *quem urbis Troiae excidium uidisse certissimum est* (Lact. on Th. v. 752) with Nestor; but in II. iii. 73 *Iliacos aequare senes et uincere persta* a reference to Tithonus seems an almost ridiculous hyperbole, though the plural may possibly be thought to include him with Priam. Returning to II. ii. 107-8

> Sis felix, tellus, dominis ambobus in annos
> Mygdonii Pyliique senis

there is a congruity in coupling Nestor with Priam, an exaggeration with Tithonus. In III. iv. 103-5 where Statius prays that Domitian may attain to the years of Troy and Pylos *together* (Iliacos Pyliosque simul) the tone of the passage is extravagant, and poetically there would be nothing impossible in praying that he might survive for many hundred years; yet here too I should lean to the other belief as more congruous. The same question meets us in Verg. *Catal.* xi. 15, 16 *Carmina quae Phrygium saeclis accepta futuris, Carmina quae Pylium uincere digna senem*, where the same principle, the better congruity of Nestor with Priam, seems to me to decide the point in his favour against the comparatively mythical husband of Aurora.

(2) 133-137

> Tempus erat, cum te geminae suffragia terrae
> Diriperent, celsusque duas ueherere per urbes,
> Inde Dicarcheis multum uenerande colonis,
> Hinc adscite meis, pariterque his largus et illis,
> Ac iuuenile calens plectrique errore superbus.

Klotz seems to think that *plectri errore* can refer, not to Pollius, but to poems written in his honour by some Dicharchean (Puteolan) or Neapolitan. This is, of course, impossible. The only question is, what is *plectri errore?* Stephens says 'plectro errante super citharam'; Gronov similarly explains it by the words of Athenaeus πάσας ἅμα τῷ πλήκτρῳ τὰς χορδὰς ἐπιτρέχοντες; others of the turns and alterations of lyric poetry. Looking at the passage as a whole it seems more natural to refer it to the wandering life Pollius led between the two cities; he was proud of his wandering lyre, probably from the applause he gained as an *improvisatore*.

(3) I cannot see why McNaghten's more than probable explanation of the MS. reading in I. i. 27-8

> te signa ferente
> Et minor in leges iret gener et Cato *castris*

as referring to Castra Cornelia, 'a strong position about a mile from Utica' mentioned

by Caesar, *De Bello Ciuili* ii. 24, 2 should be rejected as not likely. *Constans*, which Klotz approves, will not commend itself to a trained ear, or rather will be pronounced perfectly impossible.

(4) In the disputed passage V. iii. 169-71

Baianaque mittunt
Litora qua mediis alte permixtus anhelat
Ignis aquis et operta domos incendia seruant

Klotz explains *domos seruant* of the subterranean fires which do not destroy the houses *by not breaking out*. This view is Gronov's (*Diatrib.* i. p. 360) 'neque enim incendia proprie seruant domus, aut faciunt ut illae illaesae maneant; sed inter incendia continua domus illaesae manent et seruantur; ideo incendiis ascribit Poeta quod existit una et conjunctum est cum incendiis, nimirum durationem et conseruationem aedium.' Against this I allege the use of *domum seruare*, *limen seruare*, in Vergil (*Aen.* vii. 52, vi. 402) for keeping close to the house or threshold: so in Statius the subterranean fires each keep close to their assigned home, *i.e.* in the buildings built over to utilize and protect them.

Robinson Ellis.

THE REVENUE LAWS OF PTOLEMY PHILADELPHUS.

Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus. Edited from a Greek Papyrus in the Bodleian Library, with a translation, commentary, and appendices by B. P. Grenfell, M.A., and an introduction by the Rev. J. P. Mahaffy, D.D., Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1896. With Portfolio (13 plates). 31*s.* 6*d.* net.

In recent years countless Papyri have found their way from the Fayoum to the Museums of Europe but as yet nothing has been announced comparable in historical interest to this great document which now rests secure among the treasures of the Bodleian Library. The Revenue Papyrus, as Mr. Grenfell has named it, although, as Prof. Mahaffy remarks, the tax-farming or Telonic Papyrus would be a more exact designation, consists of two parts. The first, containing columns 1—72, was bought by Prof. Petrie from a dealer in Cairo in the winter of 1893–4. It is a roll dated in several places 'in the 27th year' of Philadelphus *i.e.* 259/8 B.C.; the length is 44 feet, the height cannot be so precisely determined since the papyrus has been broken near the top, but it varied from 9½ to 13 inches. When purchased, the whole roll was in a most delicate and brittle condition, and only those who have seen it can properly appreciate the dexterity and patience shown by Prof. Petrie in separating the folds and mounting the detached fragments. The outer parts have been long exposed to wear and tear, so that the first 15 columns are a hopeless wreck; more writing is preserved as the heart of the roll is reached, but even here every column shows a gap varying from 8 to 2 lines. The second part, embracing columns 73—107, is a collection of fragments acquired by Mr. Grenfell at Cairo and in the Fayoum during the winter of 1894–5. They are terribly mutilated, hardly a single sentence remaining complete, and reconstruction is impossible, but internal evidence indicates that they came from a sister roll, which originally measured not less than 15 feet in length, and was probably once wrapped round the first roll.

The despatch with which this important discovery has been placed before the world cannot be commended too highly. Let us hope that the French scholars who have excavated Delphi will imitate this English example rather than the precedent of their compatriots who worked at Delos. Mr. Grenfell did not see the papyrus until June 1894; he was obliged to suspend his work during the winter of 1894–5 while absent in Egypt, and yet by the autumn of 1895 he succeeded in completing a transcription, translation, commentary and appendices. But this volume of 250 pages produced with such speed is not disfigured by carelessness or superficiality. The editor has done everything that can be done to lay a solid foundation. He has consulted with the two foremost European specialists on Ptolemaic papyri, Prof. G. Lumbroso of Rome, and Prof. U. Wilcken of Berlin, and has enjoyed the constant help and criticism of Prof. Mahaffy, who has examined with him all the problems of reading and interpretation, revised the whole work, and contributed a general introduction of lv. pp.

The result is an edition which promises to remain *princeps* in order of importance as well as of time. The text is a model of philological accuracy. The reader may feel confident that every peculiarity of the original is faithfully reproduced. The papyrus is for the most part written in large clear hands—Mr. Grenfell distinguishes 12, examples of which can be studied in the excellent facsimiles produced by the photographers of the Clarendon Press—but in many places owing to stains or injury to the surface no small patience and skill is needed to decipher the writing. In the transcript uncertain words or letters are marked by dots, and wherever these signals of doubt are not appended, the editor's decision may, I believe, be taken as final. Moreover, the document contains erasures and corrections of various kinds, and large additions, which in two cases take the form of notes on the *verso* with a direction ἔξω ὅρα at the point in the text to which they belong. For interpretation it is of some importance to distinguish changes made by the scribe from the alterations introduced by the reviser, and Mr. Grenfell has made the way easy for the student by using for the latter a different type. Further, the roll is riddled by holes and fractures. No pains have been spared to fix by accurate measurements the extent of the lacunae and the places of the broken fragments, and I am prepared to accept without reserve the warning to critics in the preface that no emendation is admissible that does not take account of the number of dots between the square brackets used to denote gaps. But the evidence of parallel passages either in this papyrus or in other papyri of the same period and dealing with the same subjects has been applied by the editor and his coadjutors with such acuteness and prudence that in the field of conjecture but scanty gleanings are left for those who come after. Here and there a happy guess may hit on a word or phrase to fit a gap, but it is not likely that any very valuable or extensive supplements will be discovered until fresh material for comparison is brought to light. I fear from some remarks at the close of the third Appendix (p. 240) that the remainder of the Petrie collection which Mr. Grenfell hopes to publish in the course of the next few years will not contribute much to the elucidation of the Revenue Papyrus, though there still seems hope of getting some hints from the papyrus mummy cases found by Mr. Grenfell at Gurob in the spring of 1895.

The translation and commentary are executed with the same care and thoroughness as the text. Indeed the notes form a substantial addition to our knowledge of the Egypt of the early Ptolemies, for Mr. Grenfell has not only assembled illustrative matter from the published papyri of various collections, but has been permitted by the liberality of the author to draw upon the materials of the Corpus of Greek Ostraca and the Corpus of Ptolemaic Papyri, which are being prepared by Prof. Wilcken. Although much still remains uncertain and obscure and the interpreter stands too often on fragile hypotheses, the time may come, as Prof. Mahaffy anticipates, when the labour and ingenuity of scholars will succeed in reconstructing a connected and trustworthy account of the entire financial system of the Ptolemaic Exchequer. The first Appendix is a new and corrected text of a document similar in character to the Revenue Papyrus, viz. Papyrus 62 of the Louvre collection (*Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits*, xviii. ii. 1866), which Mr. Grenfell re-examined in September 1894, at the suggestion of Prof. Lumbroso. The second brings together from the Petrie Papyri some unpublished fragments on cognate subjects. In the third, which is almost a treatise by itself, Mr. Grenfell boldly attacks the central problem of Ptolemaic Numismatics, the relation of silver to copper. I am not competent, had I the space, to examine the particulars of the solution proposed, for the coinage of the Ptolemies is a labyrinth I have never explored. A careful reader, who can appreciate what constitutes proof and refutation will perceive that Mr. Grenfell's vigorous reasoning has swept away much rubbish; and authorities such as Profs. Wilcken, Gardner and Mahaffy have expressed general approval of the new theory which is the fruit of the discussion. The work is crowned by complete *Indices* of words, names, symbols and abbreviations.

Some account of the contents and significance of this great roll will prove, I hope, more acceptable to readers of the *Classical Review* than scattered criticisms of minutiae of interpretation. The Revenue Papyrus, once kept among the papers of a government office, sets forth the rules which governed the rights and duties of tax-farmers. The first 72 columns are divided into three sections marked off from each other by spaces of blank papyrus. The first chapter (A), cc. 1—22, is very imperfect, the first 15 columns being ruined, but the fragments

that can be made out warrant the conjecture that this portion was devoted to general regulations defining the relations of government officials in each district, particularly of the Oeconomus and his Antigrapheus, to the men or companies of men who undertook the farming of the State Revenues. The second chapter (B), cc. 23—37, contains the orders and regulations for the transmutation of the share (*ἀπόμοιρα*) of one-sixth of the produce of the vineyards and orchards (*παράδεισοι*) of Egypt, hitherto paid to the gods of Egypt, into a government tax, payable nominally to the deified queen, Arsinoe Philadelphus. The third chapter (C), cc. 38—72, is concerned with the State Monopoly in the manufacture and sale of oil. It is plain that other taxes, *e.g.* on various cloth stuffs, were treated in cc. 73—107 and in fragments 1—6, but the only important fact that can be extracted from these miserable remnants is that the Royal Banks were farmed.

The best way of realising the complexity of the Egyptian system of taxation and finance is to look first at the simpler methods of a Greek Republic, *ἀρξάμενον κατὰ φύσιν ἀπὸ τῶν πρώτων*. At Athens the *τελώνης*, as his name implies, actually bought the tax, for a definite sum of money, generally payable in instalments (*καταβολαὶ*) at specified dates. On the conclusion of the bargain the proceeds of the tax became for a time his private property, for which he rendered no account to the treasury. He appointed and paid the collectors, who were responsible to their employer, not to the state. Provided that the instalments were paid punctually, he had little to fear from the interference of the executive. The long list of Athenian magistrates shows no board to control the extortions of tax-farmers. Any organised supervision might have defeated the purpose of the system, which was to relieve the state of an invidious and burdensome task. Tax-payers and tax-collectors were left to fight out their differences by actions at law brought before a court of judges (*δικαστήριον*) according to the familiar principles of Athenian jurisdiction. The only special regulations discoverable are that in suits brought by and against tax-farmers judgment had to be given within a month from the lodgment of the plaint, and that the Receivers General (*ἀποδέκται*), the board before whom such cases were taken, were empowered to settle on their own authority trivial disputes involving less than 10 drachmae.

The tax-farmer in Egypt under the early Ptolemies is in a very different position. Let us take first the management of the *ἀπόμοιρα*. What first surprises an enquirer fresh from Greek city-states is that the person described as 'the purchaser' (*ὁ πριάμενος τὴν ὠνήν*) does not collect the tax. The sixth of the produce of orchards was paid in money and was got in by a government official, the oeconomus (c. 29, 10—11). The sixth of the produce of vineyards was paid in kind, *i.e.* in wine. When the grapes had been gathered and the wine made, the cultivators (*γεωργοὶ*) conveyed the due proportion to the repository (*ἀποδόχιον*) established in their village by the oeconomus and were given by him a stamped receipt (*ἀποσφράγισμα*). The wine thus collected was sold by the oeconomus in the presence of the tax-farmer, the antigrapheus (a servant of the crown) and the deputy of the antigrapheus. Lastly, the oeconomus exacted payment of the price from purchasers, and put the sum down to the account of the tax-farmers at the Royal Bank. Here (c. 33, 6/7) there is an unlucky lacuna: *πράσσων τὰς [τιμὰς . . . . .] ετω εἰς τὸν τῆς ὠνῆς λόγον ὑπὲρ τῶ[ν πριαμένων] τὴν ὠνήν*: but whether Wilcken's suggestion *προσθέτω* be taken or not—and I should prefer *διαγραφέτω* as in c. 77, 4—the significance of the clause is unmistakable: it proves that the purchase money was not collected by the tax-farmers, and, when collected, was not immediately handed over to them, but was placed to the credit of the 'account of the farm' at the Royal Bank.

Now, what was the form of this account? How was it kept? The practice of Athens might prompt the answer that on one side were placed the sums actually paid in by the tax-farmers as instalments of the price they had engaged to give for the tax, while on the other side was set the money received by the government agents, who really managed the collection of the tax. But there are serious objections to the hypothesis that the farmers of the *ἀπόμοιρα* made periodical payments to the bank separate and distinct from the amounts placed to 'the credit of the farm' by the Crown officials who received the tax. The balancing of accounts in the case of this particular impost is described in these words: '*When all the produce has been sold, the oeconomus shall take with him the chief tax-farmer and his partners* (*τὸν ἡγορακότα τὴν ὠνὴν καὶ τοὺς μετόχους αὐτοῦ*) *and the antigrapheus and shall balance accounts with the chief tax-farmer and his partners. If there is a surplus left over* (*ἐὰν μὲν ἐπιγένημα περίῃ*), *he shall pay* (*ἐπιδια-*

γραψάτω) *to the chief tax-farmer* (here ἀρχώνῃ) *and his partners through the Royal Bank the share of the surplus due to each member of the company. But if there prove to be a deficit* (ἐὰν δὲ ἔγδεια γένηται) *he shall require the chief tax-farmer and his partners and the sureties to pay each his share, payment to be exacted within the first three months of the following year*' (c. 34, 10 *sqq.*). The problem is to understand the nature of this '*deficit*,' which might be discovered at this final balancing of accounts at the close of the contract. If the idea is '*in case the tax-farmers have failed to pay in full the stipulated price of the tax*,' the writer has expressed his meaning very badly. And if it be assumed that the farmers have paid out of their own pockets purchase-money for the tax, why is it that only *the surplus* is divided among them? Would they not have a right to the *whole* of the tax? If this proved less than the price paid, the speculators would lose; if it proved more, they would win; in either case the transaction would be ended. The truth seems to be that the example of the Greek city-state is misleading. In Egypt the tax-farmers paid no instalments which can be distinguished from the returns of the tax. Under the fiction of a purchase they gave a guarantee to the government that the revenue from a tax should reach a certain sum. If more money was collected, they received the '*surplus*'; if, however, there was a '*deficit*,' i.e. *if the revenue fell below their estimate*, they had to make up the difference and save the State from loss.

No doubt the tax on vineyards and orchards with which I have started is a peculiar case, because all the money came in together in the latter part of the year, after the vintage and fruit-gathering; and it is conceivable that some of the taxes and contracts mentioned in the mutilated columns 73–107 were managed on other principles. At the same time the regulations in the first chapter (A) of the papyrus seem to apply to all tax-farmers indiscriminately, and here again, as in the second chapter (B) which deals with the ἀπόμοιρα, we find in the description of the monthly balancings (c. 16 *sqq.*) '*deficit*' (ἔγδεια) more than once contrasted with '*surplus*' (ἐπιγένημα). The 16th column fails just at the point where valuable information must have been given, but a comparison of cc. 16, 17, 18, 19 tells against the view that in the course of each month the tax-farmer paid out of his private funds a fixed sum, which at the end of the month was set off against the taxes actually received. What happened appears to have been this. In the case of some taxes—not all, as the instance of the ἀπόμοιρα shows, if proof be needed of what is obvious—the farmer guaranteed not only that the state should receive a particular total, but that so much should be paid into the bank in the course of each month. The accounts of each month were made up before the tenth of the following month. If the stipulated amount had not been received, there was a '*deficit*'; and the farmer with his sureties might be called upon at once. But if more had been taken by the collectors and paid into the bank, the '*surplus*' thus arising was not handed over to the farmer, but carried on to the account of the next month. The State paid nothing to the farmer before the end of his contract. It sometimes happened, however, that the same company had entered on several contracts. If in such a case at a monthly reckoning a surplus in one farm coincided with a deficit in another, the surplus was lent to the farm which required it, the sureties being thus saved from the necessity of making good at once the deficit. If at a subsequent reckoning a deficit occurred in the farm which had thus lent its surplus to assist the distress of another farm, the oeconomus in charge of the monthly accounts first recalled this surplus. As this caused the deficit in the other farm to reappear, his next step was to make a call upon the sureties of that farm, in order that the proper revenue for the month might be secured. The general review of the accounts of the farmers came at the end of the year. The oeconomus added up what had been received as tax, and what had been paid by the farmers and their sureties to meet deficits or for other reasons, which are specified. From this he subtracted what was still owing under various heads, and set the total thus gained against the sum which the farmers had put upon the revenue of the tax. If it was found that the Government had received more than this estimate, the tax-farmer was given an order on the bank (19, 4 ἐπιγραψάτω) for the surplus. A deficit however was reported by the oeconomus to a higher authority, ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς διοικήσεως τεταγμένος, who examined the accounts before instructing the oeconomus to recover the debt within a stated period. The object of this reference may have been to discover whether the company or farmer liable for the deficit had successful contracts in other nomes. But this is only a guess.

The general rules of the first chapter

(A) indicate further that the collection of all taxes was under the supervision of the government. The oeconomus and antigrapheus (c. 13) acting in concert with the chief tax-farmer determined the number of collectors (λογευταί), subordinates (ὑπηρέται), and keepers of receipts (συμβολοφύλακες) needed in a farm. Unregistered agents were prohibited under penalties (c. 12). A collector received 30 dr. a month, a subordinate 20 dr., a keeper of receipts 15 dr., an inspector (ἔφοδος) 100 dr.; apparently the tax-farmer had no voice in the appointment of an inspector. These salaries were provided out of the sums collected (λογεύματα c. 12, 13), and seem to have been paid by the antigrapheus of the oeconomus (c. 12, 11), though lacunae make this point uncertain. Even in the actual work of collecting the tax the oeconomus or his deputies play a part; thus the chief tax-farmer and his partners are forbidden to receive payments except in the presence of the oeconomus or the antigrapheus; and the tax-farmer's subordinates are threatened with penalties, if they accept money without the concurrence of the antigrapheus, or do not hand over to him any sums which they may have exacted.

But if the tax-farmer did not relieve the government of all the trouble of collection, what purpose did he serve? In one case the answer is clear. The papyrus is complete enough to give some idea of the duties of the farmer of the ἀπόμοιρα. In the first place, the cultivators before beginning to gather their grapes were bound to give notice to the tax-farmer and invite him to inspect the vineyard. Secondly, he had a right to watch the making of the wine and see that the measures of capacity used in the work were such as government officials had tested, sealed, and approved. If grapes were gathered and wine made before the arrival of the tax-farmer or his representative, the peasants were required to keep the wine at the vats (ἐπὶ τῶν ληνων) and report before a certain date the amount of wine so made andthe vineyard from which the grapes had been taken. When on any estate the wine was all made and its quantity had been duly measured, written statements (called συγγραφαὶ) were drawn up by the cultivator and tax-farmer respectively. The tax-farmer declared under oath that he had entered the full amount of the produce including all wine made prematurely and reported to him by the cultivator, that he had appropriated none for himself, that he had suffered none to escape his attention. The cultivator on his part declared that he had exhibited all the produce and reported all wine made before the proper time and entered honestly the amount due as tax. These documents or copies of them—the papyrus here is imperfect—were transmitted to the oeconomus. The oeconomus decided disputes between cultivators and tax-farmers about the amount of the produce. If the tax-farmer, though requested by the cultivator, failed to make the proper συγγραφή, he lost his rights; the government represented by the oeconomus and antigrapheus stepped into his place, concluded the συγγραφή, and on receipt of the wine were forbidden to credit the value of it to the account of the tax-farmer. The ἀπόμοιρα from orchards needed a different treatment. Since the tax was not paid in dates and fruit but in money, a valuation of the crop was necessary. If the tax-farmer accepted the assessment of the cultivator, συγγραφαὶ were drawn up as in the case of vineyards, and the oeconomus exacted one-sixth of the value declared. If the tax-farmer objected to the cultivator's valuation, he was empowered to take over and sell the crop at his pleasure, on condition of paying over to the cultivator the proceeds of each day's sales. When the cultivator had recovered the sum at which he had estimated his crop, the surplus became the property of the tax-farmer, and the cultivator was required to pay the oeconomus one-sixth of the real value. If on the other hand the crop did not fetch the amount of the cultivator's assessment, the tax-farmer was in some way liable to the oeconomus for the difference, but the details are lost in a lacuna.

The object of these rules is excellently explained by Mr. Grenfell (p. 105). '*The complicated system described, of which the central fact was the separation of tax-farmer and tax-collector, rendered it as certain as any system could render it, that the Treasury received what was due, the whole of what was due, and nothing but what was due. For if the oeconomus attempted to defraud the government either by granting exemptions or by peculations, the loss would fall on the tax-farmers, who would then lose their surplus, and therefore had the strongest motive for seeing that the oeconomus kept the accounts correctly . . . On the other hand it was impossible for the oeconomus to exact more than the legal amount of the tax, because the amount was fixed by a contract between the tax-farmer and cultivator, over which the oeconomus had no control. And if the tax-farmer tried to extort more than he was*

entitled to, in one case, by the no less ingenious than equitable arrangements described in c. 29 13—20 [*i.e.*, the regulations for the assessment of orchards] *he would find the tables turned on him; and in the other,* c. 28, 5—8 [*i.e.*, in consequence of the rules for estimating the produce of vineyards] *he would have to submit his demands to the oeconomus, who having no interest in allowing the tax-farmers to increase their surplus at the expense of the tax-payers, and having been expressly forbidden to take any part in tax-farming himself* (c. 15, 4), *would have no motive for giving an unfair decision. So far as mechanical safeguards could go, the interests both of the Exchequer and the tax-payer were protected at every point.*' Mr. Grenfell also observes that the tax-farmers were serviceable for another reason, because they enabled the government to make an accurate estimate beforehand of its revenue, and secured it against loss from a sudden fall in the value of crops. About this security I have my doubts. It would be interesting to get a tax-farmer's opinion on the point. The business of these speculators was to forecast the fluctuations of the market and offer no sum that would expose themselves to loss. The remains of the papyrus furnish no definite statement of the date of the auction of the *ἀπόμοιρα*, but it may be conjectured from c. 26, 13 that the tax was sold shortly before the vintage. If this guess be right, the bidders came to the sale with some knowledge of the general character of the year's crop, and they could get from the Royal Scribes an account of the acreage of vineyards and orchards liable to the tax in each nome. Probably with these data trained experts could calculate with tolerable accuracy not only the gross produce of the crops of a nome but also the price of the fruit and the wine. It must also be remembered that the tax-farmer was present at the sale of the wine and was perhaps able to influence the oeconomus in selecting the dates of the auctions and in accepting bids. Mistakes, no doubt, were sometimes made in the heat of competition, but I am inclined to believe that in the long run the government, not the tax-farmer, bore the loss from a fall in prices. Nothing in this document indicates that the responsibilities of the tax-farmer were so great and the profits so meagre, that men could not be found to face the risks. Yet such was the end of the system. The Louvre Papyrus (Appendix I.) shows significant cracks and rents in the elaborate and artificial structure; and the edict issued by the Praefect of Egypt, Tiberius Julius Alexander, on the accession of Galba—it is cited by Mr. Grenfell on p. 114—reveals the collapse of the edifice: *ἔγνων γὰρ πρὸ πάντος εὐλογωτάτην οὖσαν τὴν ἔντευξιν ὑμῶν ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ ἄκοντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς τελωνείας ἢ ἄλλας μισθώσεις οὐσιακὰς παρὰ τὸ κοινὸν ἔθος τῶν ἐπαρχειῶν πρὸς βίαν ἄγεσθαι, C.I.G.* iii. 4957, 10 *sqq.* But in spite of complaints and promises of relief the compulsion continued under other names, for the *πράκτορες ἀργυρικῶν*, whose receipts are common among the papyri of the Imperial age, were not officials but men of substance discharging an onerous *λειτουργία*.

Many difficulties beset the account of the State Monopoly in oil, which occupies the third chapter (C) of the papyrus, and it is particularly hard to understand in this case the position of the farmer or 'purchaser,' and the nature of his profits. The oils mentioned are sesame oil, kiki or castor oil, made from the croton plant (*ricinus communis*), *κνήκινον*, made from *κνῆκος*, probably a species of artichoke—as Prof. Mahaffy points out, the papyrus confirms 'cnecinum' in *Plin. N.H.* 15, 7, 30, a reading printed in the 16th century by Gelenius but rejected by some modern editors (*e.g.* Mayhoff) in favour of 'cnidinum'—colocynth oil, made from the seeds of gourds, and linseed oil. The regulations are almost entirely concerned with the production of sesame oil and kiki, and do not expressly state that the other three kinds were manufactured under the same conditions. The absence of olive oil from the list is remarkable; Prof. Mahaffy suggests that the tree, which flourished in the Fayoum in the time of Strabo, was introduced by the Greek military colonists (*κληροῦχοι*) planted in this region during Philadelphus' reign.

In each nome the State had the complete control of the manufacture and sale of sesame oil and kiki, and possibly of the other varieties as well. It prescribed the number of acres to be planted with sesame and croton, it supplied in certain cases seed to the cultivators, and it bought the whole crop at a fixed price per *artaba;* to sell the seeds to a private person was a punishable offence. Oil might only be manufactured in the 'King's Factories.' Not only were private persons forbidden to make or sell oil but it was illegal even to possess oil presses and mortars. The only exception allowed was in favour of the priests of the temples, who were permitted to make, under inspection, sufficient sesame oil for the annual consumption of their societies, but were compelled to buy their kiki from the govern-

ment agents. The law fixed the site and equipment of the factories, the status and wages of the workmen, and the minimum quantity of oil to be produced daily at each mill. The oil turned out was sold at monthly auctions to registered dealers in each village, who were bound to retail it to the inhabitants at a fixed price. The procedure at the auctions is obscure, so that the value of the monopoly cannot be made out with certainty. But it seems probable that the dealers were only allowed a definite percentage as brokerage and could not by combination force down the price at the auctions in order to increase their own gains. There are indications that the profits of the State were considerable. The retail price in the nomes of a metretes of sesame oil containing 12 choes was 48 dr. Now the Crown took from the contractors in the nomes a certain amount of oil for use at Alexandria. It defrayed the cost of carriage and of the jars (*κέραμος*) but paid for a metretes of sesame oil containing 12 choes only 31 dr. $4\frac{1}{4}$ ob. Apparently this sum covered the price of the raw material, the wages of manufacture and superintendence, and miscellaneous expenses. The profit, then, on every metretes of sesame oil sold in the nomes may have been as much as 14 dr., a deduction being allowed for brokerage.

This monopoly was leased to contractors, each nome being treated as a separate unit, almost as a little kingdom with a frontier and custom houses. It is worth while to sketch roughly the rights and duties of the 'purchasers' (*οἱ πριάμενοι τὴν ὠνήν*). In theory they were tax-collectors as well as manufacturers. The government professed to pay the cultivators 8 dr. for an *artaba* of sesame containing 30 *choenices* prepared for grinding, and 4 dr. for an *artaba* of croton containing 30 *choenices* prepared for grinding, the *choenix* according to Wilcken being approximately a litre. But a tax of 2 dr. was levied on each *artaba* of sesame, and of 1 dr. on each *artaba* of croton, and it was paid not in money but in sesame and croton. Thus the cultivator received *e.g.* 8 dr. for an *artaba* of sesame but had to return 2 dr. in sesame. Why the government did not simply give the cultivator 6 dr. is a mystery, especially as the classes described as *ἀτελεῖς* (c. 43, 11) only get 6 dr. for each *artaba* of sesame. The first task of the 'purchaser' was to assess the crop. The method resembled that employed for vineyards. Accompanied by the nomarch and toparch or their deputies he visited the fields as soon as the crop was ready for gathering, and settled with the peasant the value of the harvest. The results arrived at by the two parties were embodied in *συγγραφαὶ* authenticated by the seal of the government agent present. Secondly, the 'purchaser' superintended the manufacture of the oil. His powers were restricted. It was the office of the oeconomus and his antigrapheus to establish the necessary factories, to equip them with plant, and to furnish a proper supply of raw materials. Apparently it was the oeconomus or his deputy who paid the workmen their wages. The workmen were tied to their factories, and if any of them crossed over into another nome, they were subject to arrest not only by the contractor but also by the oeconomus and antigrapheus, and there is evidence to show that in practice the work of fetching back runaways devolved upon the officials of the Crown. The principal duties of the contractor were to compel the men to work regularly, to ensure that a specified minimum of produce was converted into oil every day, and to guard against illicit manufacture of oil, either in the Crown factories or by private persons, though even in this province he was checked by a clerk appointed by the oeconomus and antigrapheus, and possessing joint authority over the men, the factories, and the plant. The sale of the oil to the dealers was in the hands of the oeconomus and antigrapheus, who received the purchase money and paid it into the royal bank.

Now, what was the nature of the 'purchaser's' contract with the Crown? Looking at the general regulations of the first chapter (A) of the papyrus and at the administration of the tax on vineyards and orchards the reader is tempted to answer that the farmer of the oil monopoly was responsible for the profits from the sale of oil to the retailers, *i.e.* that he engaged that a certain amount of money should be received monthly by the royal treasury, on condition of receiving any surplus over the sum guaranteed and of making good any deficit. The tax may be left out of account; for if, as seems likely, the sesame and croton collected as tax were taken to the factories and made into oil, its only effect was to reduce the price of these seeds by one fourth.

But Mr. Grenfell urges (p. 127 *sqq.*) that there is little room here for a deficit or surplus such as that mentioned in A and B, and concludes that '*the Government farmed out the oil monopoly, not in the least to secure a fixed revenue, for the revenue from it was fixed already, but to ensure the economical manufacture of the oil, while the tax-farmers received a definite reward for their labour in*

superintending the manufacture and sale of the oil instead of an indefinite surplus.' It appears to me that the revenue could not be fixed, and that the appearance of a surplus or a deficit on the whole contract depended on the competition at the auction. Let us try to place ourselves at the point of view of a bidder for the oil monopoly of a particular nome. He knew the exact cost of making a metretes of oil; and he could guess within narrow limits the price that would be got for it from the retailers. What could not be known was how many metretae he would make and how many he would sell. The first element of uncertainty was the crop. The government published a statement of the number of ἄρουραι that would be sown with sesame and croton, and undertook to compensate the purchaser of the monopoly, if through the neglect of its servants the specified acreage was not planted. But the government did not guarantee him against bad seasons or bad husbandry, and the speculator could not avoid some risk, since the contract ran for two years. It is true that the price of the seeds was fixed, but, notwithstanding this security, any failure in the supply of raw material was of serious moment to the contractor. He could not increase his profit by reducing wages and other miscellaneous expenses, for they were not under his control. Neither could he help himself by more economical processes of manufacture, for it is stipulated in c. 58 8/9 (= c. 60, 15–17) that '*if the flow of the oil* (ἡ ῥύσις) *produces a larger amount, it shall belong to the Treasury.*' This clause implies that the State required that a fixed amount of oil should be produced from a fixed quantity of raw materials; and it is highly probable that the lacuna at the head of c. 47 gave the ratios for the various seeds. Thus, if the contractor managed to extract a larger percentage of oil, he was not permitted to reap the advantage. He was therefore peculiarly dependent on the harvest; the number of metretae that contributed to his profits was necessarily in a fixed ratio to the number of *artabae* that came to the factories. The second element of uncertainty was the consumption of oil in the nome. The contractor's output might not be all taken up by the retailers. On the unsold oil there was no profit, but at the same time there was no loss, as the farmer was compensated for the oil and raw materials he left behind on giving up the contract (c. 53) and, though there is some uncertainty in consequence of lacunae, every thing points to the conclusion that he received the approximate cost price of the oil and seeds left in stock. If, then, there were fluctuations in the crop and the sale, a bidder for the oil monopoly would be in the same position as a bidder for the tax on vineyards and orchards. He calculated to the best of his ability the probable profits for the next two years; he then deducted from this sum what appeared to him an adequate reward for his labour and risks, and engaged that the government should receive the rest. If he rashly guaranteed too much money, there might be a deficit; if he was prudent, he got for himself a surplus.

For these reasons I hesitate to assent to Mr. Grenfell's statement that in the oil monopoly there was little room for a surplus or deficit such as that mentioned in A and B. But I recognise that the theory of the transaction which I have presented has weak places. The main difficulty lies in the description of the monthly balancing of accounts between the farmer of the monopoly and the clerk appointed by the oeconomus (c. 54, 20 *sqq.*). No provision is made for the contingency of a deficit on the month's working or of a surplus to be credited to the farmer's account. The reckoning aimed only at discovering the net profits on the oil sold in the course of the month; the money received from the purchasers of oil was set against the price of the seed and the various expenses incidental to manufacture and sale (wages, jars, carriage etc.), but nothing is said about the disposal of the balance and its relation to the receipts guaranteed by the contractor. The third chapter of the papyrus is badly drafted and shows many erasures and corrections and bracketed passages but such an omission at just this place is staggering. The absence of any description of the final settlement at the close of the contract is far less surprising, for this part of the papyrus may be, and probably is, imperfect. It cannot be plausibly maintained that the general regulations of the first chapter (A) make further details in the third chapter (C) entirely superfluous.

A second difficulty arises from the use of ἐπιγένημα and μισθοί in this third chapter. In c. 41 it is ordered that the nomarch, toparch, oeconomus and antigrapheus shall compensate the holders of the monopoly, if the published number of acres has not been sown with sesame and croton, paying them the tax on the seeds which they had a right to expect from the unplanted land, and also τὸ ἐπιγένημα τοῦ ἐλαίου καὶ κίκιος. In c. 45

we read that ἀπ[ὸ τοῦ] γενήματος τοῦ κατεργαζομένου (πωλουμένου *was first written and afterwards corrected*) ἐλαίου the workmen (ἐλαιουργοί) are to receive 2 dr. 3 ob. (*corrected from* 3 *dr.*) on every metretes containing 12 choes and of this the workmen (ὁ ἐλαιουργὸς καὶ οἱ κόπεις) shall have 1 dr. 4 ob. (*corrected from* 2 *dr.*) and the farmers (οἱ τὴν ὠνὴν ἠγορακότες) 5 ob. (*corrected from* 1 *dr.*). Mr. Grenfell reports that there is not room for ἀπ[ὸ τοῦ ἐπι]γενήματος and suggests that γενήματος is one of the mistakes of the first scribe. Further, the items of the monthly account in c. 55 include τὸ συντεταγμένον μερίζεσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπιγενήματος τῷ ἐλαιουργῷ καὶ τῷ τὴν ὠνὴν διοικοῦντι (l. 10) and lower down in the same column occurs the following sentence: οἱ δὲ μισθοὶ τοῖς πραγματευομένοις τὴν ὠνὴν διδόσθωσαν ἀπὸ τοῦ μεμερισμένου ἀπὸ (*altered to* ἐκ) τοῦ ἐπιγενήματος (l. 13, 14). It is clear that in these passages the word ἐπιγένημα cannot mean, as in chapters A and B, the surplus of the actual receipts of the monopoly over the sum promised by the purchasers. The key to the meaning is given by the first passage cited above, that from c. 41; there τὸ ἐπιγένημα τοῦ ἐλαίου καὶ κίκιος must signify, as Mr. Grenfell shows, the profits of the monopoly, *i.e.*, the difference between the cost price and the selling price of the oil, and this sense will also suit all the other places in this chapter where ἐπιγένημα is found. But I cannot agree with Mr. Grenfell, when he argues that a share in this profit, viz., the 5 obols on each metretes which are mentioned in the second passage cited (c. 45) constituted the μισθὸς or wages of the contractors, and that this pay was the main, if not the only inducement to undertake the task of superintending the manufacture. The auction seems to me inexplicable, if the purchasers of the monopoly were substantially hired servants of the crown, who had before them nothing but a prospect of receiving on a metretes of oil a percentage which is only one half of that assigned to the workmen in the factory. I prefer to suppose that the regulations in this chapter are badly drawn, and that the salaries (μισθοί, c. 55) meant are the sums paid to the servants of the contractors. It may fairly be doubted whether any company that undertook the oil monopoly of a nome was so numerous that it could depute a partner to superintend every factory in the district. I venture to suggest that many of these superintendents were salaried subordinates, and that their wages were made a charge on the profits of the monopoly in accordance with the principle laid down in the general regulations of the first chapter (A), where it is provided (c. 12) in the case of farmed taxes that collectors and subordinates shall be paid out of the money collected. The words in c. 55 (τῷ διοικοῦντι τὴν ὠνὴν and τοῖς πραγματευομένοις τὴν ὠνὴν) are not fatal to this interpretation and the phrase used in c. 45 (οἱ τὴν ὠνὴν ἠγορακότες) may be regarded as a pardonable carelessness of expression; the writer says '*the purchasers of the monopoly shall receive 5 obols*' without any intention of excluding the idea that in general the money went to the superintendent, who might or might not be a partner in the company.

In his book on the Political Economy of Egypt under the Lagidae Lumbroso quotes from Rossi the opinion that '*en matière de douanes les modernes n'ont absolument rien inventé.*' Rossi was thinking, I imagine, of the scientific extortions of the *Bas-Empire*, and did not dream that in the third century before Christ the Greeks in Egypt were administering a financial system as intricate and highly organised as anything invented by the bureaucracy of Imperial Rome. But these all-pervading tax-farmers, this network of officials, these banks and comptrollers and elaborate balance-sheets, are they creations of the Greek intellect setting itself to work out the consequences of Absolutism as logically and thoroughly as it had developed at Athens the opposite ideal of government by the people? Or do we catch in this papyrus a glimpse of *arcana imperii* familiar to the great Pharaohs and inherited by each new master of the valley of the Nile? *Rien n'est plus à souhaiter que la découverte de documents nouveaux et moins mutilés.* The wish with which in 1870 Lumbroso ended his discussion of the difficult Louvre Papyrus may be repeated in 1896 with hope more assured.

W. Wyse.

BLAYDES' *ADVERSARIA IN AESCHYLUM.*

Adversaria in Aeschylum scripsit ac collegit F. H. M. Blaydes, LL.D. Halle 1896. Pp. 356. 7 Mk.

This book has been something of a disappointment. In the last few years I have found Dr. Blaydes' collections on Aristophanes of such great service that I looked forward to this work in the hope of obtaining help of the same nature upon Aeschylus. But it is plain at once that during his wide reading Dr. Blaydes has not had the text of Aeschylus in his head as he has had that of Aristophanes. The illustration has a far narrower range, consisting largely of similar words and phrases in tragedy—so that much of it is but a fragmentary concordance—while of the rest there is much that may be found in any commentary. Nor, perhaps, was it worth while in the *Appendix* pp. 311–354 to transcribe from my essay *On Editing Aeschylus* (I cannot but recognise the source) some score of collections without the argument they were enlisted to support.

Having begun so long ago, Dr. Blaydes may be excused for[1] using Dindorf's text, though it is now quite obsolete. But unfortunately there is no sign that he has thought it necessary to ascertain the MS. readings. He has been content to treat the text of Dindorf or of Weil as if these were the *data* for criticism. Naturally this has sometimes deprived his remarks of value. For example: *Theb.* 609 '*φύει*] Leg. *φέρει* aut *φορεῖ*.' *φύει* is Wellauer's correction of the MS. *φύσει*. *Supp.* 477 '*καὶ πολλαχῇ γε*] *καὶ πόλλ' ἄχη καὶ* Burges. Qu. *ναί· πολλαχῇ*—, vel *καὶ πολλαχῇ τοι*—.' But the MS. gives *καὶ μὴν πολλαχῇ γε*. The original, I suspect, was *οὐ μὴν ἁπλῇ γε* (as your *μῦθος* is *ἁπλοῦς*).., *κακῶν δὲ πλῆθος*. Cf. *O. T.* 519, Philemon 28, 9.

Cho. 318 '*ἀντίμοιρον*] Qu. *ἰσόμοιρον*.' *ἰσόμοιρον* is the gloss that caused the MS. *ἰσοτίμοιρον*, of which *ἀντίμοιρον* is Erfurdt's emendation. *Eum.* 177 '*ἐκ γένους*] Qu. *ἐγγενῆ*.' Neither *ἐκ γένους* (Weil) nor *ἐγγενῆ* (Hartung) nor any of the many conjectures accounts both for the MS. *ἐκείνου* and for the schol. *Eum.* 277 '*πολλοὺς καθ' ὅρμους*] Haec non intelligo. Tentabam *ἕτερα τε πολλά*.' The lemma here is a conjecture discarded by Weil, who now, like Wecklein, is inclined to approve Herwerden's *πολλοῖσι καιρούς*. The MS. *πολλοὺς καθαρμούς* I believe to be sound and rightly explained by the second schol.: 'Taught by misfortune, I am well versed in the lore of purification—I know when to speak and when to keep silence. But on this occasion I was commanded to speak.' Orestes alludes to the silence enjoined on the blood-polluted (v. 451); he is explaining why he breaks it.

In *Eum.* 616 (p. 348) *τὸ δή μοι* is merely a conjecture of Weil's for *τόδ' αἷμα*: and I do not know who is responsible for *νοῦς γέρουσιν εὖ μαθεῖν* in *Ag.* 587 (p. 185), or for *λέχη* in *Eum.* 386 (p. 345), or for *θεῶν* in 553 for which B. (p. 347) suggests *φόβου*. The MS. is *ἐκ τῶν δ'*, corrected by Wieseler to *ἑκὼν δ'*.

Dr. Blaydes' method is indicated by his remark (p. 327) on *Ag.* 718 *ἀγάλακτον οὕτως ἀνήρ* (where Wecklein well conjectured *ἀγάλακτα βούτας ἀνήρ*), 'Si corrigas *ἀνύποπτος οὕτως ἀνήρ*, optimus evadet sensus.' That is too often the only condition of which he takes account. Metre he disregards again and again; not hesitating, for example, to propose in *Pers.* 994 *μελέῳ ἔντοσθεν*, *Theb.* 896 *αὐτοὺς μένουσι*, 1013 *τυμβοχόα κτερίσματα*, *Ag.* 218 *σφάξω*, 256 *ἔμελψε, μαλακᾷ δ'*, 259 *τὰ δ' ἐνθένδ'* for *τὰ δ' ἔνθεν* (which we are not to take for *τἀντεῦθεν* 'namque *ἔνθεν* relativum est.' Yet *τὰ δ' ἔνθεν* 'the sequel' is read in Eur. *fr.* 621), 718 *λέοντος σκύμνον δόμοις ἀθήλαστον*, 1251 *ἦ κάρτα νοῦν παρεσκόπεις*, *Cho.* 427 *κροτητὸν* 'Ατρείδου or *ἀνδρὸς δή* (with what sense?), 992 after four other guesses 'nunc mihi unice verum videtur *μύραιν' ἂν αὐτῆς ἢ 'χιδνα*,' *Eum.* 545 *λαξ πατήσῃς*, 772 *ἀμηχάνους παρέξομεν δυσπραξίας* or—*οις ταράξομεν*—*αις* (read *πρέψομεν*?). *Theb.* 809 is not comparable with Eur. *El.* 1318; *κακοφάτιδα βοάν* in *Pers.* 938 is not a dochmiac but an anapaestic dipody resolved; *φρενοδαλής* in *Eum.* 331, for which, p. 344, he suggests *φρενοβλαβής*, is correct, the metre being paeonic as *Cho.* 802.

The character of the annotations leads me to infer that attention to Aeschylus belongs to an early period of Dr. Blaydes' studies; that he has long laid him by, and resumed him again lately, with enthusiasm unabated, but without realizing the advance that has been made meantime towards the elucidation of this exacting author. He seems to have recorded any conjectures that he has come across, the greater proportion of the modern being contributed by F. W. Schmidt, Naber

[1] Throughout this article I shall use, as always, Wecklein's numeration.

and Herwerden ; the rest date mostly as far back as Burges, who figures very largely. It was at the least superfluous to publish these at all, because they, with everything else up to 1892, may be found in Wecklein's complete and conscientious records. But somehow both Wecklein's text and his invaluable *Appendices* have contrived apparently to escape Dr. Blaydes' notice. He would have found that a great number of the emendations he proposes have been proposed already. Among such as are new, I gladly call attention to the following : supply in *Pers.* 863 *ἀπαθεῖς <αὖθις ἐς> εὖ πράσσοντας ἄγον οἴκους.* (*οἰκία εὖ πράττουσα* is a correct and frequent phrase.) Dr. Blaydes' own suggestion is *αὖθις αὖ* , and in *Cho.* 804 he proposes *δὸς αὖ ἰδεῖν*, but the shortening of *αὖ* before a vowel does not seem to me probable : in Homer it always remains long, except possibly in *αὖ ἐγώ* K 292 (=γ 382), Ω 595, where *ἐγώ* may suffer prodelision, as often in Attic ; cf. λ 58. The cause supposed for the omission is the usual one, similarity of the neighbouring word. On the same principle, in *Eum.* 313 (where B. quotes an unmetrical conjecture by Wakefield) I would supply *φανερῶς* after *χεῖρας* or *καθαράς*—postulated, I think, by the antithesis in 317—and in *P. V.* 424 *ἀρχαιοπρεπῆ <σεμνοτάταν> στένουσι τάν* . . In *Theb.* 719 B. suggests *καπφθιμένους* or *καπφθιμένοισιν κατέχειν* for *καὶ φθιμένοισι κατέχειν*, where *καί*, if correct, must mean 'also' (not 'even') ; but it has always arrested me, and I had myself thought of *καπφθιμένους ἐγκατέχειν*. In *Supp.* 523 *ἀεὶ δ' ἀνάκτων ἐστὶ δεῖμ' ἐξαίσιον, ἀεί γ'* may be right ; cf. *P. V.* 42, Alexis 257. The clue to that line is to recognise that *δεῖμ' ἐξαίσιον* must be the subject, and *ἀνάκτων* the predicate—an adjective. I had thought of *ἄνοικτον* 'pitiless' (cf. Ar. *Rhet.* Cope ii. 8, 6 and 12) ; but the appropriate word seems rather to be *ἄναρκτον* 'exceeding terror is ever uncontrolled' ; cf. *Theb.* 245, *P. V.* 907–911, *Cho.* 1020–2. In *Eum.* 52 B.'s *κἀς τὸ πᾶν* is necessary, unless *μέλαιναί τ'* (Hartung) is right. In *Eum.* 591 *ἔκτεινα· τούτου γ' οὔτις ἄρνησις πέλει* (for *τούτου δ'*) gives the point : cf. 466, 614 *δρᾶσαι γάρ, ὥσπερ εἶπον* (as I find Davies had already emended *ὥσπερ ἐστὶν*), *οὐκ ἀρνούμεθα· ἀλλ' εἰ δικαίως εἴτε μὴ* : 'To the act, as I said, I plead guilty : the question is whether the homicide was justifiable.' Cf. *P. V.* 51 *ἔγνωκα· τοῖσδέ γ' οὐδεν* (Hartung for *κοὐδὲν*) *ἀντειπεῖν ἔχω*. (In *Pers.* 740 read *τοῦτό γ', οὐδ' ἕνι στάσις*?) At these last three notions I had myself arrived ; and I find Dr. Blaydes coinciding with me in the following, published shortly before in the *Journ. of Philol.* 46, *Ag.* 886 *κυκώμενον* (for which add Apoll. Rhod. i. 1327), *Eum.* 23 *ἐπιστροφαί*. In *καὶ πλέον Ag.* 563 we had both been anticipated by Wilamowitz and Sonny. *ὑπὸ δὲ γᾶν* in *Eum.* 175 (for *τε*) after the negative is a correction already made by Heyse. In *Eum.* 375 *βαρυπεσῆ*, B. is surely right in appealing for *βαρυπετῆ*, as *προπετής*, *εὐπετής*, *χαμαιπετής*, *δακρυοπετής* : add *δυσπετής*, *περιπετής*, *γονυπετής*, *διοπετής*, *δϋπετής*, *ἀεροπετής*. I may mention also his suggestion of *ἀνθήματα* in *Theb.* 263.

I wish I could find more. But Dr. Blaydes has not gone deeply enough into the thought and language of his author, and is too little bound by textual probabilities for much to commend itself to me. Too often it is enough for him, when he finds one word, to bid us read another : *P. V.* 116 *ἄφραστος* for *ἀφεγγής*, 473 *διῆγον* for *ἔπρασσον*, *Theb.* 229 *κωκυτοῖς ἐπί σφ' ἀνθίζετε*, 713 *παιδολέτειρ' ἔρις* for *παιδολέτωρ δ' ἔρις δ' ὀτρύνει* (read *ἐξοτρύνει*, Greg. Cor. p. 711), 840 *κουρίμῳ* for *πόμπιμον*, 894 *οὐδέ γ' ἄχορος Ἄρης*, *Supp.* 14 *ἄλγιστ' ἀχέων*, 884 *στέναζε* for *ἴυζε*, *Ag.* 826 *τῷ λελημμένῳ νόσῳ* for *τῷ πεπαμένῳ νόσον* (which is heightened for *τῷ ἔχοντι τὴν νόσον*), 1510 *πιαίνεται* for *βιάζεται* or *ἐλθεῖν* for *μέλας*, *Cho.* 81 *δυστάνοισι* for *ματαίοισι*, 100 *κοινὸν ἄχθος κομίζομεν*, 338 *ἀμέγαρτος* for *ἀτρίακτος*, *κατεύγματα* to end 398 (*Γᾶ χθονίων τε τιμαί* H. L. Ahrens rightly), 422 *ἐκοψάμαν τὸν Ἄρειον* or *τὸν θρῆνον ὥστε*, 447 *μιμουμένη* for *κεκρυμμένα*, 611 *κλύω* for *στυγεῖν*, 745 *χαράν* or *φάος* for *τριβήν*, 821 *ἀλκά* for *ἄτα*, 843 *χἄτυμ' ὄντα* for *καὶ βλέποντα*, 969 *μολοῦνται* for *πενοῦνται*, 1020 *τέθριππον ἡνιοστρόφον* for *ξὺν ἵπποις* (add *δ'*) *ἡνιοστροφῶ* (Stanley for *-οῦ*), *Eum.* 253 *προσέβαλεν* for *προσγελᾷ*, 266 *βοσκὰν ἐμὲ πιεῖν*, 464 *ἑλοῦσ'* or *λαβοῦσ'* for *κρύψασ'*, 492 *ὅρκον διδοῦσα . . κρινεῖν*, 565 *δύαις μαχόμενον* or *παλαίοντ'* or *δύαισι ληφθέντ'* for *δύαις λαπαδνόν*, 668 *κεκλημένη* for *τεθραμμένη*, 956 *ἄπληστον* for *ἀμβλωπόν*, 987 *κάστυγεῖ*, 1032 *τὸ λοιπὸν εὐοδῷ τὰ σύμφορ'*, *ὡς πρέπει*. These are fair samples of the wares before me. It would be painful to show how incredible they all are. With the best will in the world, it is impossible to take them seriously.

A few observations to conclude.

Pers. 430 : Dr. Blaydes may add Ar. *Nub.* 1316 *κατέχουσι δ' Ἔρωτες ἕδρας* (*ἐμᾶς* MSS.) *πόλεως*, as Eur. *Tro.* 556, *Eum.* 11. *Theb.* 549 (p. 76 B) read *ἀλλ' ἀληθεύσαιμ' ἐγώ. θεῶν θελόντων* qualifies the boast preceding. *Theb.* 777 *παῖδες μητέρων τεθραμμέναι* many besides Dr. Blaydes have supposed to be either corrupt or incomplete. It is only a paraphrase of *μαμμόθρεπτοι* 'molly-coddles.'

See Eust. 971, 27, Lobeck *Phryn.* p. 299, and cf. *μαμμάκυθοι* Ar. *Ran.* 990 Blaydes, *τηθαλλαδοῦς* Kock *Com. Att.* iii. p. 401.

Theb. 960 (=975) read *ἄλγε' ὅμοια τάδ' ἐγγύθεν* for *ἀχέων τοίων* (*στόνων* B., which is unmetrical). *Theb.* 976 (p. 91 B.) for *δίγυρα τριπάλτων* I conjecture *δίδυμα τριπλᾶ τε*: cf. *Pers.* 1034, *Cho.* 788 with Wecklein's note. On *Supp.* 65 *πενθεῖ νέον οἶκτον ἠθέων* B. mentions only Burges' meaningless *νεοσσόν*. If in 59 *ἔγγαιος* is correct, *μὲν* (Haecker) is a likely substitute for *νέον*: if (which the choriambic metre favours) *ἐγγαῖος* should be read with Bamberger, then *πενθεῖ γόον οἰκτρὸν* seems probable: cf. *e.g.* Aesch. *fr.* 291.

On *Supp.* 861 *ησυδουπιατάπιτα* B. quotes Wecklein's notion that *Κατάδουπα* 'Cataracts' (Hdt. ii. 17) is concealed. Read *τί σύ, δουπιαχαπύτα;* 'what mean you, with your *beating of the breast* (*δουπ—*), *wailing* (*ιαχ—*) and *shrilling* (*ἀπύτα*)?' Cf. Soph. *Aj.* 630, and for *τί σύ;* Eur. *Alc.* 29, Herodas i. 9, Ar. *Lys.* 136, *Av.* 136, *Ach.* 803, *Ran.* 1454, Xen. *Symp.* 3, 7. Compound epithets are constantly misapprehended by copyists, who usually split them up: as new suggestions I offer *Theb.* 84 *ὠτιχριμπτεῖ βοᾷ* (or *ὠτοχ—*), *Supp.* 848 *γαϊάναξ* (as *ἱππιάνακτας Pers.* 999, *πασιάναξ*: cf. Lobeck Phryn. 674), *Ag.* 552 *στυγοστράτῳ* (*σοι δηλ.*), *Eum.* 499 *ἐτυμοπαιδότρωτα* 'inflicted by own children': *ἔτυμος, ἐτήτυμος* are commonly used of true-born children (*On Ed. Aesch.* p. 152, where add Philostr. *Apoll.* vi. 40 *ἐπὶ τῷ ἔτυμα καὶ ξυγγενῆ τίκτειν*), and the compound is as facile as *ἐτυμόδρυς, αὐτόπαις, Ἐτεοκρῆτες, Ἐτεοβουτάδαι* (=*Βουταδέων ἐτύμων* Kaibel *Epigr.* 852). B. p. 346 suggests *ἕτερα*, which supposes an unlikely corruption.

In *Supp.* 870 *ἄγειος ἐγὼ βαθυχαΐος βαθρείας βαθρείας* (p. 155 B.), *Ἀργεῖος* (Ellis) was Bothe's conjecture. *βαθρείας*, I take it, should be *βαθείας* (*γῆς δηλ.*), the *ρ* having been superscribed to indicate a reading *βαρείας*. *Supp.* 1012 (p. 159 B.) should end, I believe, with[1] *ἀνεωγμέν' ἱμέρῳ*.

Ag. 78 *Ἄρης δ' οὐκ ἐνὶ χώρᾳ.* 'Miror nemini criticorum in mentem venisse emendationem simplicissimam et certissimam *οὐκ ἐνὶ γήρᾳ.*' B. p. 327. No alteration is required. *ἐνὶ χώρᾳ* means 'in his place,' 'at his post,' *ἐν τῇ τάξει*, and should be read in *Supp.* 987 for *ἐν χώρῳ τάσσεσθε*. Cf. Callim. *h. Del.* 192 pp. 41, 305 Schneider. In *Ag.* 386 *ἀτολμάτων Ἄρη πνεόντων μεῖζον ἢ δικαίως* B. suggests *ἀνανδάτων*. But the clue to the passage is that *πνεόντων μεῖζον ἢ δ.* is complete in itself, and does not govern *Ἄρη* (or *e.g. ἀτολμάταν ἀρήν*). I conjecture *ἀτολμάτῳ 'ν Ἄρει* 'in an unjustifiable war.' *Ag.* 504 (181 B.) *ἀποστερῶ*? Cf. Nikolaos Walz *Rhet.* i. 330 *πολλὰ μὲν < οὖν > τοιαῦτα λέγων ἀποστερῶ τά λοιπὰ μὴ προσθείς*. B. adds to the conjectures on *Ag.* 1234 *θύονσαν Ἄιδου μητέρα*, which no editor yet has understood, though it is rightly explained by Lobeck on *Aj.* 802. The genitive, like *Ἐρινύων, ἄτης* is equivalent to an adjective, *hellish, infernal*, including the senses *cursed* or *deadly;* and serves as an expletive, *the devil's own*. The use is extremely common in tragedy, and occurs also in later authors, as I mean to show another time. Two examples will be enough for the present: Eur. *Cycl.* 293 *τῷ θεοστυγεῖ Ἄιδου μαγείρῳ*. Aristias Trag. 3, 1 *μαζαγρέτας Ἄιδου τραπεζεύς* 'damned bread-collecting trencherman.' *Ag.* 1251 Hartung's *παρεκόπης* (not mentioned by B. pp. 213, 327) may be confirmed by Bekk. Anecd. 428. 25 *Ἀποκοπῆναι τῶν ἰχνῶν τὴν κύνα λέγουσιν ὅταν μηκέτι εὑρίσκῃ τά ἴχνη.* (Suid., Hesych.).

Ag. 1451 (p. 223 B.) *φέρουσ' ὁμιλεῖν* would be exactly like Soph. *Aj.* 1201: cf. Pind. *N.* x. 72, *I.* ii. 37.

Ag. 1605 (p. 226 B.) *τρίτην γάρ ὄντα μ' ἐλπίδ'*? Cf. *Cho.* 235, 772, 695, Aeschines ii. 190, Callim. *Ep.* 21, *A. P.* viii. 389, *Epigr.* Kaibel 116, Thuc. iii. 57, Persius ii. 35 Casanb. p. 101.

Cho. 281 *ἐπαντελεῖν* is a mistaken alteration for *ἐπαντέλλειν*. In proclamations including laws) the present or aorist inf. is used in *or. obliqua*, the *or. recta* using not the future but the imperative. [On *O. T.* 272 the schol. may well be right in saying *φθαρῆναι δεῖ γράφειν, οὐ φθερεῖσθαι*]. The present is idiomatic also in *Cho.* 548 *κτείνωνιν*, where B. says '*κτενῶ* recte Turn.' It is common in prophecies, or warnings, *ὅταν τις προλέγῃ τι*, as *Pers.* 217 *σωθεὶς δ' ὁμοίως τῆσδε κοιρανεῖ χθονός*: '*ποιμανεῖ* aut *δεσπόσει* conj. Dind., quum futurum requiratur . . . verum videtur *δεσπόσει*.' B. *δεσπόσει* is only credible if *κοιρανεῖ* were a gloss, which is impossible. Or of a prospect, as *Cho.* 507 *αὐτὸς δὲ σώζῃ τόνδε τιμήσας λόγον.* 'Qu. *σώσει*' B. Cf. *P. V.* 529, 540, Eur. *El.* 974, *I. T.* 977–980, and emend Aesch. *Supp.* 410 *τί, τῶνδ' ἐξ ἴσου ῥεπομένων, μεταλγεῖς τὸ δίκαιον ἔρξας;* (for *ἔρξαι*) 'what have you to rue, if . . .'

In *Cho.* 480 *φυγεῖν μέγαν προσθεῖσαν Αἴγισθῳ* which he attacks on p. 248, Dr. Blaydes would finally have us read *με γᾶν* p. 333. In dialogue we should have *γῆν* (Paley). But, as Orestes desires possession

[1] Beginning, it may be, with some form, of *κασωρ—*, as *κασωρικῷ λίουσ'. . = κασαλβαδικῷ*. I should be glad of help.

of his father's house (477), so Electra's wish is to *escape* from her servitude (135) and *get married*. Schuetz first saw this from 484 and schol. At present she is prevented, for fear of her bearing a son to take vengeance (Soph. *El.* 961 *sqq.*, Eur. *El.* 22 *sqq.*, 266). Hence laments for her unwedded state, Soph. *El.* 164, 187, Eur. *Or.* 72, 196, 656, 1049. Conjectures on this view may be found in Wecklein. τυχεῖν (Schuetz) μ' ἔτ' ἀνδρός (*Eum.* 960, Ar. *Thesm.* 289) would serve: but I think most likely φυγεῖν μ' ἐς ἀνδρός, a bride being said to *enter a husband's house*: Herodas v. 70, *Anth. Append.* Cougny ii. 401, Plut. *Brut.* 13, Eur. *I. A.* 1225, and the elliptical phrase εἰς ἀνδρός (which is as old as Homer) is affected in this sense by the Atticists: Alciphr. iii. 41, Liban. iv. 418. 9, Philostr. *Imag.* i. 16. 3, *Gymnast.* 27, *Apoll.* viii. 25, Plut. *Mor.* 405 C, *Lexiphanes* in Lucian ii. 337. In *Cho.* 944 Dr. Blaydes would prefer δυσόρμου τύχας. A contrary change, τὰ δύσοιμα *invia* for δύσορμα, seems plausible in Xen. *Cyn.* 10. 7.

In *Eum.* 1033 βᾶτ' ἐν δόμῳ B. approves Naber's βᾶτε δρόμῳ. But imagine the scene! βᾶτέ μοι, ὦ sounds natural. He supplies no parallel to the phrase εἰς τὸ πᾶν χρόνου (corrected from χρόνον) in *Eum.* 673. Comparing 291, I should prefer χρόνῳ to εἰσόπιν χρόνου (*Supp.* 625). But on *Eum.* 1042 ἵλαοι δὲ καὶ εὐθύφρονες γᾷ, he affords me a serviceable quotation in Theocr. v. 18 αἴτε μοι ἵλαοί τε καὶ εὐμενέες τελέθουσιν. These adjectives—it is remarked by Stephanus in the *Thesaurus*—are habitually so combined, as by Xen. *Cyr.* i. 6. 2, iii. 3. 31, Plat. (see Ast *s. v.* ἵλεως), Alciphr. i. 38. Is it not strange, then, considering the statement in the argument of Aristophanes τὰς δὲ Ἐρινύας πραύνας προσηγόρευσεν Εὐμενίδας, that we do not find ἵλαοι δὲ καὶ εὐμενέες γᾷ —a suggestion of the title rather than the title itself, Εὐμενίδες—and that, when immediately afterwards they are addressed by their other euphemistic name, δεῦρ' ἴτε, σεμναί < μοι >? Surely it was here if anywhere.

WALTER HEADLAM.

CHRIST'S EDITION OF PINDAR.

Pindari Carmina prolegomenis et commentariis instructa, edidit W. CHRIST. Lipsiae in aedibus B. G. Teubneri. MDCCCXCVI. 14 Mk.

TWENTY-FIVE years ago Christ edited the text of Pindar for the Teubner Series. In this handsome and beautifully-printed quarto volume, in which he resumes his labours on the great lyric poet, he devotes cxxx pages to the *prolegomena*, in which he discusses the MSS. of Pindar, his metrical art, the public games and odes of victory, the life of the poet, and the Pindaric heroes, of whose genealogy he supplies three elaborate tables. His text, with footnotes, critical and explanatory, and indices, fills 466 pages more. The Latin of the *prolegomena* is most graceful, and the labour spent on the book must have been enormous. But I cannot think that the work adds materially to our knowledge of Pindar from any point of view. It would seem as if most of the book had been written some considerable time ago and had never been brought up to the level of contemporary speculation. The aesthetic aspects of the odes of victory are entirely neglected, or consulted only by the application of a superlative adjective like *pulcherrimum* or *splendidissimum* to the poem, before he proceeds to an analysis of it, in which we certainly cannot feel that he is carried away by his emotions. What I mean will be clearly seen by any reader who takes the trouble to compare his introduction to the fifth Nemean ode with Mr. Bury's stimulating *aperçu* of that exquisite poem. On the ingenious and plausible theory of the nomic structure of the odes he offers no opinion, nor yet on the more fanciful, but still fascinating, hypothesis of 'echoes and responsions.' Possibly Christ thinks that an editor of Pindar is no more bound to discuss these speculations than an editor of Shakespeare to deal with the supposed Baconian authorship and the cryptogram. But at least we should have welcomed a word from him, even to that effect.

As to the text, he claims the credit of having steered a middle course between the conservatism of Tycho Mommsen and the radical method of Theodor Bergk. How far we may venture to say that Christ lacks the caution of the one and the brilliancy of the other, our readers will be better able to judge when they have before them a

selection from his own contributions to the constitution of the text, and some examples of the choice which he has made between the rival suggestions of preceding critics. As regards the latter, that I may not be guilty of vain repetitions, I would refer readers to a review by me of Prof. Fraccaroli's Pindar in *Class. Rev.* viii. 5 pp. 207–209 (May, 1894). I there regretted that Prof. Fraccaroli had apparently overlooked certain emendations which appeared to me very convincing; but, as he did not present a text, but only a translation, it seemed natural that in most cases he should accept the traditional reading without much examination. In all these cases Christ, though he undertakes a complete recension, reproduces the traditional reading, either without mentioning the emendation or with a palpably weak reason for not accepting it, as in the case of Bergk's brilliant and certain *ἀν' Ἀμφιάρειον* in I. vi. (vii.) 33. When even Bergk's best suggestions are often passed over in silence or expressly rejected, it is not surprising to find that foreign scholarship receives scanty recognition. There is, however, an exception. He has discovered the brilliant vindication of the optative without *ἄν* by Prof. Gildersleeve on *κεινὸς εἴην* O. vi. 45. He accepts it, referring to 'Gildersleevius' by name; but the two other passages, P. iv. 118 and P. x. 21, where the optative really rests on the same basis, he treats differently, reading in the former *μὲν ἵκω* for *ἱκοίμαν*, and in the latter *αἰεὶ* for *εἴη*.

The following are his own chief modifications of existing texts. In O. vi. 72, for *μετάλλασεν* he reads with A *μετάλλασσεν*, which he renders *in aliam sedem transferebat*. But surely there could be no such a 2nd aorist from *ἀλλάσσω* or any of its compounds? Yet the imperfect would plainly be out of place. In P. vi. 50, *ὀργᾷς ὃς ἱππείαν ἐσόδων*, the genitive is not Pindaric; the conjecture, moreover, had already been made (and apparently abandoned) by M. Schmidt. In reading *κάλλιπεν θανότοι'* in P. xi. 58, as he adds ⁋ *scripsi dubitanter*, we ought not perhaps to say more than that the critic (like the woman) who hesitates is lost. In N. i. 48 *δέος* for *βέλος*, though it has MS. authority, looks very like an early conjecture. In N. ii. 15 Christ accepts Bergk's *ἐπάϊσ'* for *ἄκουσεν*, in ignorance or neglect of the robust and literal interpretation of *ἄκουσεν* by Dr. Monro in the *Classical Review*, vol. vi. No. 1 and 2; and instead of the clever conjecture *ἥρῳ θεὸς* put forward in the same Review, he reproduces the *ἥρως θεὸς* of the MS. in N. iii. 24, though Pindar expressly distinguishes heroes from gods in a celebrated passage. Nor does he seem to have heard of Dr. Postgate's excellent *ὁ πέραλλον* for *ὑπέραλλον* in the same ode, nor of Mr. Fennell's *περανγάζων* in N. x. 61. In N. iv. 37 *καΐπερ*, read by him for *καίπερ* of B D, is an obvious improvement on Bergk's *κεΐπερ*. Perhaps his worst conjecture is *βίᾳ θάνεν* for *βοαθόων*, N. vii. 34. The direct reference to the death of Neoptolemus is just what the poet skilfully avoids throughout the ode, the conjecture demands a considerable alteration of the MS. reading, and the rejected word is eminently Pindaric. In the same poem the punctuation

εἶρειν στεφάνους· ἐλαφρὸν ἀναβάλεο, Μοῖσα τοι·

is a strange perversion of a fine passage.

Christ boasts that he follows the scholiasts more closely than his predecessors. He certainly sometimes adopts a characteristically prosaic comment, as, for instance, when the scholiast will not allow Pindar to say (N. x. 6) 'Hypermnestra's dissentient blade," but by reading *μονόψαφος* represents Hypermnestra as being 'in a minority of one.' Again, I. i. 38, he adopts the absurd scholiastic comment that when the poet wrote

ἔν τ' ἀέθλοισι θίγον πάντων ἀγώνων

he meant

ἔν τ' ἀγῶσι θίγον πάντων ἀέθλων.

Yet Mezger had clearly shown that *θιγεῖν ἐν* with the dative is good Pindaric Greek for 'to grasp'; so that we are not obliged to have recourse to that exploded figment of scholiasts, that there was a figure—they called it *hypallage*—according to which a poet was justified in saying one thing when he meant another. Yet in I. v. 36, when the scholium is really helpful, Christ passes it over in silence. It is when a word is omitted that the note of the scholiast is most likely to put us on the track of it. Here a word is omitted, as the metre shows in

ἀλλ' Αἰακίδαν καλέων
ἐς πλόον . . . κύρησεν δαινύμενον.

Editors have supplied various spondees to fill the *lacuna* such as *πάντων* or *τοῦτον* or *ξυνὸν*, which is the conjecture of Christ. But the comment of the scholiast shows that it is a participle which has dropped

out, and that κύρησε is (as it ought to be) an auxiliary verb. The scholium is ἔτυχεν ἀνευρὼν εὐωχούμενον Τελαμῶνα. It seems nearly certain that the scholiast found a participle in the text. Such a participle, acceptable to Pindar for its Homeric complexion, and likely from its rarity to suffer corruption, would be τετμών, and the verse probably ran,

ἐς πλόον τετμὼν κύρησεν δαινύμενον.

As Mr. Bury accepted this conjecture and put it in his text, the editor might have at least told us why he thought that on this passage the evidence of the scholiast was to be rejected.

He accepts Bergk's hypothesis that Pindar used an accusative plural of the α and ο declensions in -αις and -οις, actually reading in his text in I. i. 25,

οἷά τε χερσὶν ἀκοντίζοντες αἰχμαίς,
καὶ λιθίνοις ὁπότε δίσκοις ἵεν.

On the whole, one can hardly help feeling that the edition might have appeared five and twenty years ago, and not been much the poorer; and that it is hard to discover any consistent or clearly apprehended principle on which the text is based.

R. Y. Tyrrell.

HIRZEL'S *HISTORY OF THE PROSE DIALOGUE.*

Der Dialog. Ein literarhistorischer Versuch. Von Rudolf Hirzel. Erster Theil, 565 pp.; Zweiter Theil, 473 pp. Leipzig, Hirzel, 1895. 18 Mk.

This work is an important contribution to the history of literature. In some respect it reminds us of Rohde's *Griechische Roman.* The author discusses temperately the origin of the prose dialogue in Greece and traces it from its first rude germs through the splendid development of the Attic period. He is the historian of its long decline and subsequent revival in classical antiquity down to the last expiring efforts of an Augustine or Boethius. A glance at the dialogues of mediaeval and modern times is followed in the last chapter by a retrospect, in which are collected a few critical results of general application. A task so gigantic demands an encyclopaedic and almost cosmopolitan erudition to a degree which only few can attain, if the claims of Critias and Machiavelli, or Lucian, Heine and Voltaire are to be weighed in the balance, while, for purposes of illustration, reference is from time to time permitted to the '*Cortegiano,*' the '*Aristippe,*' the works of Albrecht Haller and the author of '*Der Ackermann aus Böhmen.*' Even the materials before us could not be compressed into the thousand pages here presented to the reader without the greatest economy of space. It is inevitable that some periods and writers suffer in comparison with others. Our author informs us that it is not his object to repeat once more facts generally known. Perhaps in consequence of this self-restraint the hundred pages devoted to Plato are among the very best which the book contains. It is possible that other portions of the work might with advantage have been reduced within narrower limits. The details are sometimes strewn so thickly that we fail to carry away definite outlines of the writers or their works, while the transition from period to period is insufficiently explained.

The origin of that form of composition, which the genius of Plato employed for almost every literary purpose with unequalled effect, is referred to the Socratic school. Our author is willing to allow that the tendency to dialogue is clearly manifested in many quarters during the fifth century B.C. Before Aristophanes planned the '*Clouds,*' philosophical discussions were burlesqued in the comedies of Epicharmus and in Sophron's Mimes. Even in Herodotus and Thucydides we have the story of Croesus and Solon, the seven Persian conspirators, and the Median controversy. It is curious to find the great natural philosopher Democritus personifying the senses and making them hold a sort of dialogue with reason. But, despite the rival claims of the Eleatic Zeno and Protagoras, our author concludes that only in the Socratic circle and in consequence of their revered master's death was the transition actually made to the genuine dialogue of literature from rhetorical harangue or anecdote with dramatic setting. He goes even further than this and maintains that the patriotic efforts of the Socratics largely contributed to establish Attic as a literary dialect and to perfect it as a new instrument of language. He defends the historical character of the *Memorabilia,* at least in its author's inten-

tion, as something intermediate to *χρεῖαι* and *ὑπομνήματα*, but he holds with other critics that it is not the historical indictment of Meletus, but the literary onslaught of Polycrates against which Xenophon seeks to defend his master. The very complete and thorough account of the lost Socratic writers makes us especially regret Antisthenes and Aeschines. Had we the writings of the former, they would doubtless clear up many an obscure allusion in Plato. Could the seven dialogues of Aeschines be recovered, we have reason to think that if their natural and graphic touches did not furnish a new portrait of Socrates, they would at least enable us to decide between the two we have. Although the extant dialogues form a very respectable part of the total sum of ancient prose literature, they are, alas! a mere fraction compared to those of which we know little more than the authors and the titles. It is precisely in dealing with this huge mass of fragments that most ingenuity is required, and doubtless it is his achievements in this direction of which our author is most proud. Decidedly he deserves to be congratulated for his skilful conjectures and for his courage in treating such a subject at all. Yet, when all is done, the result is inevitably disappointing: we are taken, as it were, into a vast library, our guide points to the titles on the backs of books which neither he nor we must ever hope to touch, and, after retailing with indefatigable zeal any scraps of information bearing, however remotely, upon them, he is obliged, in default of anything better, too often to fall back upon a shrewd guess as to their subject matter and contents. Thus the lost Ὁμιλίαι of Critias bears a suspicious title: on the strength of this it is conjectured to have contained conversations of Critias with friends on political subjects, possibly during his stay in Thessaly.

Limits of space forbid us to follow in detail the course of a work in which Cicero is treated as fully as Plato, and Plutarch at even greater length. We merely note in Vol. I., p. 218 a valuable appreciation of the epilogue to the *Euthydemus* in which we are surprised to find that Hirzel rejects Spengel's identification of the stranger with Isocrates. On p. 224 a novel view of the *Phaedrus* is presented, with an elaborate parallel between rhetoric and philosophy, and with illustrations from the *Oedipus Rex*, which to us are more ingenious than convincing. Compare p. 93, *n.* On p. 228 the development of the *Phaedo* is compared to Aristotle's procedure from an exoteric introduction to a philosophical discussion; while in a note on p. 231 occurs the sensible observation that it would not be difficult to separate the *Phaedo* into successive parts and to postulate a later date for the composition of the more advanced portions, precisely what Krohn has done for the *Republic*. The advocates of the statistical method will find a hard nut to crack in the remarks on p. 148. Roquette, following Dittenberger's application of the use of *τί μήν*; as a chronological test in Plato, dates the *Oeconomicus*, in which *γέ μήν* does not occur, after 387 B.C. and the *Memorabilia*, in which *γέ μήν* does occur, between the years 384 B.C. and 380 B.C.; as if the Sicilian idiom had been naturalised at Athens in precisely those half dozen years! On the next page is an equally entertaining note on the question whether the particle *δέ* can introduce an independent work as distinct from the continuation of a previous one. The account of Cicero is worthy of the author of that elaborate and important work, the *Untersuchungen zu Cicero's philosophischen Schriften*, and he finds place for a mention of Curio the elder as well as the Menippean Satires of Varro. The second volume is chiefly devoted to Plutarch and Lucian, between whom an interesting parallel is drawn. The one is a mild and gentle philosopher, who has learnt in the Academy to give all sects a hearing, though for the Cynics he has something of contempt. The other, though not entirely destitute of philosophy, any more than Isocrates, was *κύων ῥητορικός*, the sworn foe of all other schools, against whose solemn dogmatism he is the champion of sound common sense, as of Atticism in style against Asian bombast. In the writings of Plutarch Greeks and Romans join in friendly conversation; we have interlocutors taken from actual life, the circle of Plutarch's own friends; we are on historical ground. Lucian transports us to fairyland, to the realm of marvel and fancy: his persons are not individuals but types, and yet they give a wonderfully faithful picture of the times. In place of Plutarch's historical sketches we find polemical pamphlets, the weapons with which their author defends himself in contemporary controversy. Like a journalist of to-day he is not always anxious to preserve consistency; it is the situation at the present moment, the conjuncture for which he writes, that he has solely in view.

With this graphic sketch we bring to a close our account of a most interesting and instructive work, a vast repertory of materials which will fully repay careful study.

R. D. Hicks.

ARNIM *ON THE DATE OF PLATO'S DIALOGUES.*

De Platonis Dialogis Quaestiones Chronologicae. J. von ARNIM. Rostock: 1896.

THE theory or hypothesis of the comparatively late production of Plato's dialectical dialogues, especially of the *Sophist*, *Politicus*, and *Philebus*, after lying dormant for about thirty years, seems to be gaining ground in Germany, notwithstanding the passive opposition which it has encountered from the great authority of E. Zeller. The statistical investigation into the comparative frequency of certain particles and formulae has confirmed the indications of language which had been previously observed, and the historical study of logical evolution supplies a third strand to a cord that will not be quickly broken.

The present brief monograph contains an independent contribution to the statistical inquiry, dealing principally with formulae of assent. The reasoning appears sound on the whole, although the writer may seem to give too much weight here and there to isolated phenomena. But I gather that he is really quite aware of the reservations under which a method so mechanical is to be employed, and if pressed he would no doubt admit, for example, that the single use of *τί μήν;* in the *Lysis* does not necessarily prove that dialogue to be later than others about equal in volume, from which *τί μήν;* is altogether absent.

In a question which turns on what John Stuart Mill would call 'concomitant variations,' the enumeration of particular instances can never be too complete.

The exact placing of individual dialogues in the earlier group will probably always remain more uncertain than the arrangement of the six or seven latest, partly because the style of Attic prose changed more rapidly towards the middle of the fourth century than in previous years. But such uncertainties are comparatively unimportant in comparison of the main point, that the greater Platonic dialogues naturally divide themselves into an earlier, a central, and a later group, which are clearly distinguishable by ascertained peculiarities of thought and expression. When that point is gained, and not before, some further progress may be made in our knowledge of Plato.

LEWIS CAMPBELL.

TWO EDITIONS OF PARTS OF SUETONIUS' *LIVES.*

THERE are few ancient authors whose writings contain matter of such varied interest as the *Lives* of Suetonius. The unquenchable thirst for gossip may find pleasure in scandals about the dictator Caesar or details of how Vitellius enjoyed his dinner. The student of manners is equally interested in watching what the emperors did and in seeing what it was that a lettered man in the time of Hadrian looked upon as a solecism, a crime, an amiable weakness, or a bit of profanity. The anthropologist, full of the practices of savages and of the survivals of such practices among civilized folk, finds old facts receiving new light from other climes and ages. The scholar looks at the secular change in Latin, from Caesar to Suetonius, or at the 'personal equation' of the writer, comparing his style with the styles of Tacitus or the two Plinys. Yet with all these reasons for the readableness of Suetonius, neither publishers' lists nor the contents-tables of learned journals show that any very great study is at present being bestowed on him. Men whom one would pick out as specially fitted to edit Suetonius spend their labour on books more likely to be in demand at schools or colleges. A complete edition of the *Caesars*, with notes of moderate bulk, up to the level of modern study of the Roman empire, is still to seek. Friedländer's *Petronii Cena Trimalchionis* illustrates the kind of commentary we mean. Our age is impatient of the long-winded dissertations which a former generation attached to editions. Notes, as we understand them, were once excluded by essays: now, we want our information more compact, more to the point, and measured out with more regard to the shortness of human life.

To a certain extent Mr. Shuckburgh's book (*C. Suetoni Tranquilli Divus Augustus,*

edited with historical introduction, commentary, appendices, and indices: pp. i.–xliv., 1–215: University Press, Cambridge) answers the want. True, it deals with only one Caesar; true, it passes over many matters which need clearing up or on which an instructive note might have been written: but the commentary, as it stands, is business-like, and it is the work of a careful and clear-headed scholar. Mr. Shuckburgh generally knows what he means, and consequently he is likely to make his reader understand it too. It is no mere school-book that he has written. There is matter given in the notes on all the aspects of Roman life and literature revealed to us by Suetonius, and, if he does not take up every point, at least he shows how points may be taken up and usefully discussed: in short, the notes make a good introductory lesson in the art of reading a classical author. They do not get out of him everything which might be got, but they show how to go to work.

So far as we can see, the political and constitutional history have interested Mr. Shuckburgh most. The change to the principate, the way in which it was carried out, and the way in which it was disguised, make a topic which may be profitably studied in connection with Suetonius' *Augustus*, and the editor's remarks will be found useful in connecting the detached data of the biographer, in clearing up what Suetonius came too late quite to understand, and in supplementing him from Tacitus and Dion. Moreover the editor very wisely prints the whole of the *Monumentum Ancyranum* (from the text as restored and revised by Mommsen in 1883). But the consistencies and inconsistencies between what Augustus says of himself and what his biographer says of him deserve a fuller bringing-out than Mr. Shuckburgh has given them. *E.g.*, the *Monumentum*, Col. 4. 24, has something to say which is closely parallel to Suet. c. 52. As to the constitutional change, it is clearly and therefore successfully outlined for us in the introduction: but in one or two places the notes are not quite adjusted to facts which Mr. Shuckburgh knows well enough. For instance, we read in the note on c. 101, *confiscatam* (*summam*), of a large sum of money in the emperor's hands, 'kept under the head of his private property.' The expression *private property* is misleading: it should apply, if it must be used at all, to the *res familiaris principis*, whereas Suetonius was here thinking of the *fiscus*, as Mr. Shuckburgh himself intimates in a note on c. 15.

The text followed for the *Augustus* is 'mainly that of C. L. Roth, Leipzig, 1890.' But Mr. Shuckburgh does not follow Roth always or blindly. In c. 43 he is content cautiously to mark a lacuna between *histriones* and *non in foro*, and does not adopt Roth's suggestion of inserting *circensibus gladiatoriisque muneribus frequentissime editis interjecit plerumque bestiarum Africanarum venationes*, of which Mommsen approves. (Roth prints it as above; Mr. Shuckburgh quotes by some misconception *circensibus gladiatoribusque*, and so on). The preface contains some remarks on the Latin of Suetonius,—all too few, but the more welcome from the fact that Herr Smilda in his separate edition of the *Claudius*, gives none. There is a somewhat odd remark on p. xxix., that Spartianus tells us that Suetonius was secretary to Hadrian, 'but was with others displaced about A.D. 121 for paying too much court to the empress Sabina.' Surely to say this is to confuse statement with interpretation. Spartianus' own words are—*Suetonio...multisque aliis, quod apud Sabinam uxorem in usu ejus familiarius se egerant quam reverentia domus aulicae postulabat, successores dedit.*

Herr H. Smilda, of the University of Groningen, publishes for his doctor's degree a text and commentary of another of Suetonius' *Lives* (*C. Suetonii Tranquilli Vita Divi Claudii.* Pp. 184. Wolters, Groningen). We cannot discover whether this is or is not part of a larger work. It has no preface and no introduction. Herr Smilda's readers find therefore no general account of Suetonius viewed as a writer of Latin, of Claudius' place in the development of the principate, or of the emperor's personal character. We look in vain for a theory or even a painting of that singular figure; we can not tell whether the editor thinks that in Claudius pedantry predominated or low vices, cunning or folly. That side of the work he leaves to Lehmann, with whom however he quarrels on a good many single issues. A life of a man, or an edition of another writer's life of him, without a general estimate of the man, is (to use a phrase which occurs in Suetonius) sand without lime; and it is in making the estimate that historical or biographical ability of the higher kind is most clearly shown. To find the right thread, the thread on which we can string the greatest number of the matters recorded; to hit on the theory which will colligate most of the facts without arbitrarily refusing any of importance—*hoc opus, hic labor est.* Nor does Smilda grapple with the mystery of the mock-wedding of

Silius and Messalina. We have to be content with an occasional *aperçu* in the notes, which we must eke out as best we may. It is very likely true 'Sub Claudio rationem dyarchiae ab Augusto institutam severe observatam esse,' but this alone does not carry us far. It is a text without a sermon.

After expressing disappointment at this want of a proper setting for the life, we must in fairness add that the editor has worked most conscientiously at the restricted line of study which he has marked out for himself. He has chosen to take points, rather than the whole, but he treats those points in a painstaking and scholarly way. There was still something for him to glean in the comparison of literary authorities, and he does good service in the application of inscriptions (particularly recently discovered ones) to the explanation and correction of Suetonius. This latter kind of evidence, or perhaps the editor's own bent, leads him to deal chiefly with points historical, political, military, or legal (as in the long and careful discussion of Claudius' position as a private man and poor, when *in vacuum lege praediatoria venalis pependerit sub edicto praefectorum.*) These four topics of course cover a great deal of ground,—though they are not exhaustive of the subject.

A useful feature of the edition is the printing at the foot of the page of parallel passages from the other authorities,—from Josephus, Dion, or Tacitus. With these before them readers can conveniently follow Smilda's minute examination of discrepancies. Sometimes he is able to come to a clear verdict on a discrepancy: thus he upholds Suetonius' correctness (c. 14) as to the length of Claudius' consulship in the year 43, against Dion 60. 21. 2, on the strength of a convenient inscription, C. I. L. vi. 2015. Sometimes he can reconcile two accounts which seem to clash, as the reports of Suetonius and Josephus (*Ant. Jud.* xix. 228) on the feeling of the multitude when it saw the trembling Claudius carried in A.D. 41 to the praetorian camp.

There is another kind of difficulty in which an editor may be useful. It is sometimes difficult to seize Suetonius' thought even when his words are in themselves clear enough. On such occasions we are glad to have the judgment of an editor who, familiar with his author and with his period, is in touch with the author's mind. Thus in c. 15 we have the story of the woman who would not acknowledge her son until she was ordered by the emperor to marry the young man. Now, does Suetonius give this as an example of Claudius' wise or of his foolish proceedings on the judgment-seat? Lehmann calls it foolishness, Smilda holds it to be a second judgment of Solomon. We could have wished him to give reasons for his opinion, and we should still more like to know under what power the emperor acted. The tendency of the day is to find a constitutional name for everything which the early emperors did: what constitutional power, or fiction, enabled Claudius to say whom a woman should marry? A similar story is told of Theodoric, but we do not there feel so inclined to ask about the ruler's authority. Smilda does discuss fully the powers under which Claudius deprived of his citizenship a Greek who did not know Latin (c. 16), and even challenges Mommsen's opinion thereon.

At the end of c. 45 we read *In numerum deorum relatus* (*Claudius*); *quem honorem a Nerone destitutum abolitumque recepit mox per Vespasianum.* Smilda is probably right in inferring that this means that Nero first set the example of neglecting his father's worship, and afterwards cancelled his *consecratio* itself; but we cannot see that his discussion of the passage anywhere mentions what is actually said of Nero in his life c. 9, *Claudium apparatissime funere elatum laudavit consecravitque.*

No statement is made by the editor as to what text he follows or how he has come at a text of his own, but we see as we go along that he departs from Roth in a certain number of passages,—not (apparently) from fresh study of the MSS. His departures however are not particularly bold. He would expel as a gloss *quam cometen vocant* after *crinitae stellae* in c. 46, but is on the whole conservative. Thus in c. 10 he defends *Latentem* sq. against Madvig's correction, and in c. 10 he (with Roth) goes back to the MSS., *casu quodam ac* (not *an*) *divinitus*, while (against Roth) he keeps *aquila*, not *aquilae*. On the other hand he proposes (without adopting) in c. 4 *ut* (not *et*) *reliquerit*, which is a change in the direction of neatness, and in c. 20 *inter consulum sellas <sella vel> tribunicio subsellio* (or, as he prints it in another place, *i. c. s. <sella> tribuniciove subsellio*). As a rule the text is very correctly printed, the notes—and especially the references—less so.

FRANKLIN T. RICHARDS.

COHN'S *PHILO.*

Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt. Vol. I. Edidit Leopoldus Cohn. Berolini typis et impensis Georgii Reimeri. 1896. M. 9.

This is the first instalment of the long expected edition of the whole of Philo's works planned and undertaken by two young German scholars, Dr. Cohn of Breslau and Dr. Wendland of Berlin. The next volume prepared by the latter will appear early in 1897. The volume under review comprises the De Opificio Mundi, Legum Allegoria, lib. I.–III., De Cherubim, De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini, and the Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat, as well as 113 pages of prolegomena on the sources of the text, and testimonia de Philone. The form of the work cannot be too highly praised. The Greek type used is large and clear; the apparatus criticus underneath follows the lines of each page, and is clear and compact. Beneath it again are printed testimonia from the Greek and Latin fathers and from the Catenae. The paging of Thomas Mangey's edition is given in the margin and also the sections of Richter's text.

This edition is as much an advance on Thomas Mangey's of 1742, as was that upon the editio princeps of Adrian Turnebus of 1552. This last was based for the most part on a Paris MS. of an inferior family. Mangey had at his command more collations, in particular of the two precious codices of Rome and Florence; and he excelled even Turnebus in the critical acumen with which he often conjectured the right text. Yet he used his collations less than he might have, and was generally content in his notes to refer vaguely to MSS., without specifying which. The editions which have appeared since Mangey are mere reprints of his text. In Dr. Cohn's edition we at last reach a finality which nothing can possibly disturb or add to, unless it were the find of a first or second century papyrus of our author.

Most of the great codices containing the mass of Philo's works belong to one or the other of two clearly marked families; of the one of these two Dr. Cohn takes as types the Monacensis Gr. 459 (A), saec. xiii. and Venetus Gr. 41 (B), saec. xiv. He enumerates six other codices in Rome, Paris, Venice and Madrid all belonging to this family. Of the other family he takes Venetus Gr. 40 (H), saec. xiv. and Parisinus Graecus 433 (L), saec. xvi., as typical. The latter codex served Adrian Turnebus as the basis of his editio princeps. As belonging to this family, Dr. Cohn enumerates 10 codices in the different libraries of Europe. It is a curious accident that the great majority of our manuscripts of Philo thus belong to one or other of these two families, and that the codices which give an independent tradition are barely six in number, and rarely contain more than a few of the books of Philo. The third family then is constituted by the codex Vaticanus Gr. 381 (U), saec. xiii. which contains eleven of Philo's works and Laurent. plut. lxxxv. cod. 10 (F) saec. xv. et xvi. which contains 36 works. To this third family belongs also a third MS. viz: Vatican. Gr. 379, saec. ineunte xvi., from which Turnebus' codex (L) was corrected; also three others described in detail by C.

The fourth family is constituted by a single codex, Mediceus or Laurentianus plut. x. cod. 20 (M), saec. ineunte xiii. This most interesting book belonged to Francisco Philelpho, and contains 28 works of Philo. It is a small and minutely written book of which the tradition goes back to an uncial copy. Its scribe often failed to read his exemplar aright or indeed at all. I believe myself that many of the faults of which M is full arose through dictation; many more are plainly due, as C observes, to the wrong division of words continuously written in uncials. This codex is also connected by certain far back errors with the first of the families as above enumerated. A fifth family is perhaps formed by codex Vaticano-Palatinus Gr. 248 (G) saec. xiv. which contains 29 of Philo's works. Its tradition indeed often agrees with one or another of the other families, but it also not seldom alone has preserved true readings. A sixth family consists of codex Vindobon. theol. Gr. 29 (V) saec. xi., which unhappily only contains the first half of the De Opificio; for it excels in its tradition all other codices and has in it a notice that it was copied (mediately of course) from the first parchment edition of Philo's works which was prepared from papyrus copies in the fourth century by Euzoius and Acacius, bishops of Caesarea. It is descended therefore from the copy of Eusebius and Origen, and the codex of which it is a mutilated representative contained

according to the table prefixt to the text the lost Quaestiones et Solutiones in Gen. et Exod., lately recovered in old Armenian.

Such are the codices and families examined and classified by Dr. Cohn in his prolegomena. Other important codices such as Paris 435 and the Selden and Lincoln codices of Oxford do not contain any of the works edited in this first volume, and will be described by Dr. Wendland in the next.

Beside these sources Dr. Cohn has had three other important witnesses, namely (I.) a long papyrus of Philo lately found in Egypt and edited by V. Scheil in 1893. This papyrus in the De Sacrificio Abelis et Caini agrees with the third family above described (UF) in some characteristic faults. It is free from most of the vices of this third family and has often kept the true reading where all the codices alike are corrupt. At the same time it shares certain faults with all the MSS., which makes it certain that it has decended from a common font with them, probably from the copy of Origen and Pamphilus. The old Latin version of Philo made not later than the fourth century embraces none of the works of Philo which come into this first volume. But (II.) in the old Armenian we have an early witness to the text of the Allegoria Legum I. and II. It corrects many faults common to all the Greek sources and is so far independent of their proximate archetype. At the same time it shares with them all a few faults, so that we can infer both them and it to be derived ultimately from a single copy. Such a fault is *e.g.* found at p. 62, 25 where ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων is read in Cohn's codices MAP and Arm . . . , ἔξης ἰόντων . . . in UFL. Prof. H. Diels here conjectures ἐξηκόντων which is obviously correct.

Lastly (III.) there are the citations of Philo in Eusebius and Ambrose (who all through his works freely translates Philo); and the excerpts in the Sacra Parallela of Ioannes Damascenus and the gnomologia. All these sources have been ransacked exhaustively and methodically by Drs. Cohn and Wendland, so as to leave next to nothing for any future scholar to do in regard to the text of Philo. And now that the textual work is so far complete, let us hope that theologians and historians of christian dogmatics will take to the study of Philo, as a necessary preliminary to any fruitful exploration of their field of research. It would be invidious to mention names, but more than one leading English theologian has lately undertaken to set forth the doctrine of the Incarnation with but a slender or second-hand knowledge of Philo; which is as if one should try to expound later Greek philosophy knowing nothing of Plato.

FRED. C. CONYBEARE.

EGBERT'S *LATIN INSCRIPTIONS.*

Introduction to the Study of Latin Inscriptions. By JAMES C. EGBERT, adjunct professor of Latin, Columbia College. Longmans. Pp. viii. + 468. 8vo.

MR. EGBERT'S volume consists of an introduction, nine chapters and some indices. The introduction is principally bibliographical: the nine chapters are grouped in three parts. The first (chapters i.—iii.) deals with the history and morphology of the alphabet and numerals. The second (iv.—vi.) describes certain elements common to different classes of inscriptions, that is, the name-systems of ordinary persons and of emperors and the titles of public officials: it includes a list of emperors down to Diocletian (except some third century rulers) with dates of their *tribunicia potestas*, imperatorial acclamations and the like, and explains the senatorial and equestrian careers under the empire. The third part (vii.—ix.) details the different classes of inscriptions, tombstones, dedications, public records and so forth, and gives a few hints how to restore imperfect texts and date undated ones. The chapters in both the second and the third part have lists of 'inscriptions for practice' with comments appended to them. The indices include a long table of abbreviations (pp. 417—460), to which I shall return in the next paragraph. The book also contains a considerable number of illustrations.

The work may be characterized as a compilation. The plan of the whole is taken from M. Cagnat's 'Cours d'épigraphie' and a considerable part of the contents comes from the same source: the rest appears to have been drawn, in the main, from Ritschl's *Monumenta*, Hübner's *Römische Epigraphik* and *Exempla*, and other suitable treatises.

These authorities are sometimes followed with great minuteness. Thus, M. Cagnat's great list of abbreviations has been reprinted whole by Mr. Egbert with practically no alteration and fills nearly one-tenth of his volume, and the 'Inscriptions for practice' which illustrate the senatorian and equestrian careers seem to be extracted bodily, texts and comments alike, from the pages of Dessau. I have noticed two or three other examples of similar (if I may so style it) intelligent scissors-work, and, while it would be most unfair to call them typical, it is not at all unfair to say that Mr. Egbert has shewn a rather full appreciation of the Greek motto *τὸ καλῶς εἰπεῖν δὶς οὐκ ἐνδέχεται*. He acknowledges obligations in his Preface but I am not sure that he realises their full extent, which is very considerable.

The compilation has been made with care, and mistakes, so far as I have observed, are rare. One or two are due to Mr. Egbert's authorities, not to himself, as when the table of ligatures on p. 67 misleadingly implies that the signs for IB, ET and the like are not available for BI, TE and the like, and the notes on the alphabet call ⅃, for L, archaic (p. 61). The table of legions (p. 408) might be revised and somewhat enlarged with advantage. The Romano-British inscriptions quoted also need correction. Six occur on p. 336 and there are inaccuracies in the accounts of three. A seventh (omitted, by the way, in the index) is given on p. 266 and is also wrong. The matter is not serious, for hardly nine or ten British inscriptions have been admitted by Mr. Egbert and, if half are wrong, the total error is after all not so great. I am more inclined to make serious protest against some loose wording on matters constitutional. Octavian, I may observe, had ceased to be Octavius in 40 B.C. (p. 115). The paragraph about adlection of procurators into the senate (p. 78) is likely to mislead. It comes straight from Hirschfeld's *Verwaltungsgeschichte*, as Mr. Egbert should have stated, but, in borrowing it, he has omitted an important clause respecting the praetorian prefects. He has also stated the result too positively—more positively, at any rate, than Mommsen, and his reference to an inscription (C. ii. 4114) will, as it stands, puzzle most readers. His statement, again (p. 351), of the character of the *Lex de imperio Vespasiani* is strangely shaped and seems to rest on some misconception of Mommsen's view, though that is intelligible enough in itself. It is, by the way, not solely Mommsen's view, but that of Gibbons and others.

It remains to consider how far Mr. Egbert's book is a good 'Introduction' to the study of Roman inscriptions. It is based on good sources. M. Cagnat's 'Cours d'épigraphie' is a well-known and most admirable work, and Mr. Egbert's other authorities, so far as I know, are excellent. Nevertheless, I do not feel sure that he has succeeded. He has, I think, to a certain extent been overpowered by his material and there is a want of clearness in aim and in execution. One does not understand why some things are put in and others are not. The account of the Roman 'name,' for example, includes a multitude of details which do not really concern the epigraphist, for instance, a number of *praenomina* which practically do not occur: it omits points such as the transmission of names (*e.g.* by forming *cognomina* from the mother's *nomen*) or the uses of *civis* to denote origin, though the one often helps to combine inscriptions, the other to date them, and both frequently provide historical information of great value. Again, there is a paragraph on *adlectio* but nothing about the *ornamenta*. Again, inscriptions are quoted for illustration or 'practice' without proper explanation and the reader meets words like *pedatura*, *prata legionis*, *centurio deputatus*, *burgus*, which are not matters of ordinary knowledge. Again, Mr. Egbert has taken pains to illustrate his pages and the result is in many ways satisfactory, but it is impossible to help noticing that he has chosen his illustrations oddly. Most of them represent either bits of archaic lettering from Ritschl's *Monumenta* or outlines of imperial lettering from Hübner's *Exempla* and, while they exhibit the shape of a letter, give no idea of the look of an inscription. There is, I think, no cut in the book of an ordinary gravestone or altar or monumental slab, nor any account of the fashion of such things. Again, much is said of certain special classes of inscriptions, the fasti, the rustic calendars, the Dacian wax-tablets, but there is comparatively little about the various kinds of sacred or sepulchral monuments with which the practising epigraphist is most often concerned. Again, there are illustrations and accounts of the Duenos inscription and the Columna Rostrata, but the accounts omit the details which alone lend value to the consideration of such unique relics. It is undoubtedly hard to decide what items

should be admitted into, and what excluded from an Introduction to epigraphy, and I suppose no selection could be made which would satisfy everyone. It may therefore, be considered rather Mr. Egbert's misfortune than his fault that, in my judgment, he has not adhered to any definite principle in selecting his material. Certainly his book, while containing a great deal of information, is not wholly what I should wish to mean by an Introduction to the Study of Latin Inscriptions.

F. Haverfield.

FOLK-LORE IN ITALY.

Archeologia Leggendaria, by A. De Nino. Turin: Carlo Clausen. 1896. Pp. 75, 2 lire.

The author of this charming collection of legends of the Abruzzi ought to be better known in England. In Italy the repeated editions of his writings on folk-lore and custom[1] show that they have reached an audience outside the study, and if it were only for the naiveté and humour with which the stories are told, recalling the happiest moments of Mr. Jacobs and Mr. Lang, with an added touch of gaiety which no Northerner can compass, these records of highland imagination are a delightful possession. They are written so simply that a child of twelve summers (with a dictionary) could be trusted to enjoy them; and a selection, well translated, would make a capital children's book. But readers of the *Classical Review* will find in De Nino's collections something more than quarry for the nursery. The myth-faculty is poetry in the rough, and its essential qualities remain unaltered by time in any given community. The misfortune besetting the student of this branch of human art,—for art it is, though mainly unconscious—is, of course, that we seldom possess the originals from which the popular pictures are drawn, and to an outsider the time spent in restoring them by conjecture often seems disproportionate. But as with Romance languages, so with Romance legend; we hold the archetype in our hands, so that playful vagaries of tradition become intelligible and throw even light on the growth of legend elsewhere. In the Abruzzi the railway makes very slow progress (in every sense!), and there are still left a hundred 'wise old men' for every sceptical critic who deals destruction to their 'explanations.' One may well rejoice that so many of their artless beliefs should have been recorded before modern education has established its Euhemerus in every village; and it is singularly fortunate that the task should have fallen to a scholar like De Nino, who has not only the genuine popular sympathies and enthusiasm for antiquity which these essays show, but has long been known for the scientific precision with which he has conducted and recorded the excavations at Pentima (the ancient Corfinium);—a sufficient disproof, if such were now needed, of Mommsen's bitter saying that 'no Italian but Fiorelli and de Petra' could be 'trusted to take a measurement' or copy an inscription.

The subject of the present notice contains the legends that are attached to the chief names and natural peculiarities of the Paelignian and Marsian highlands, the mountain-core of Italy. Saturn and Sampson, Christopher and Claudius, the Sabines and the Turks, a host of Roman generals with remarkable names, giants, monks, fairies, and of course the Pope have all contributed, in the beautiful unity of time past, to make the mountains, the rivers and above all the ruins what they appear to the pious Abruzzese. Here you may read how Lake Fucinus was made; how (not Claudius but) Nero tried to drain it and perished in its waters because of an impious saying; how 'the Paladins' built Pallano; and the real true story of the rape of the Sabine women and how they built the Cyclopean walls. No one who reads the stories can doubt that he has before him genuine folk-lore with all its natural crudity and inconclusiveness; but there is at least one gem among them, the last of the series, too beautiful to be quoted. And in the characteristic Romance setting—fair ladies, noble cavaliers, rascally monks, and the rest—it is impossible not to recognise that we have here in substance a picture of the feelings and beliefs of the *mascula militum proles* that under the Roman standards went out to conquer the world.

R. S. Conway.

Cardiff, *Christmas* 1896.

[1] Others are *Usi e Costumi Abruzzesi*, Florence 1879–91, *Ovidio nella tradizione popolare di Sulmona*, Casalbordino 1886, *Il Messia dell' Abruzzo*, Lanciano 1890.

NARCISSUS.

Look not in my eyes, for fear
They mirror true the sight I see,
And there you find your face too clear
And love it and be lost like me.
One the long nights through must lie
Spent in star-defeated sighs,
But why should you as well as I
Perish? gaze not in my eyes.

μή μοι ἐς ὀφθαλμούς, μή μοι βλέπε· δείδια μή τοι
ἦν καὶ ἐγὼ ποθορῶ καί σύ ποτ' ὄψιν ἴδῃς,
ἐν δὲ κόραισιν ἄγαν τὸ καλὸν ποθορῶσα πρόσωπον
ὃν καὶ ἐγὼν ὀλόμην αὐτὸν ἔρωτ' ἀπολῇ.
εἷς ἀρκῶ πανάποτμος, ὅσαι ποτε νύκτες ἔπεισιν,
ἐλπίσι τηκόμενος τῶν φθονέουσι θεοί,
ἀλλὰ σὺ δὴ τί παθοῦσα θέλεις μετέχειν ὀδυνάων;
μή μοι ἐς ὀφθαλμούς, μὴ βλέπε—μηδ' ἀπολῇ.

A Grecian lad, as I hear tell,
One whom many loved in vain,
Looked once into a forest well
And never looked away again.
There, when the turf in spring time flowers,
With downward eye and gazes sad,
Stands amid the glancing showers
A jonquil, not a Grecian lad.

A. E. Housman.

ἦν πάϊς ἦν Ἕλλην· καὶ γὰρ λόγος ἵκετ' ἐς ἡμᾶς·
οὗ πειρᾶτο πολὺς πολλὰ μάτην ποτ' ἔρως.
ἐν δὲ νάπαισιν ἅπαξ ἔβλεψεν ἐς ἀγλαὸν ὕδωρ,
οὐδ' ἔτ' ἀποβλέψας ἄλλα, μάτην ἐπόνει.
νῦν δ' ὅποτ' εἰαρινοῖσιν ἐκεῖ βλαστήμασιν ἀνθεῖ
γαῖα, κατηφήσας ὄμματα λευγαλέα,
ὄμβροι ὅπου φρίσσουσιν, ἐν ἄνθεσιν ὥριμον ἄνθος,
οὐ πάϊς οὐχ Ἕλλην, ἵστατ' ὀδυρόμενος.

Arthur Platt.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

COLLIGNON'S *HISTOIRE DE LA SCULPTURE GRECQUE.*

Histoire de la Sculpture grecque, par Maxime Collignon. Tome Second. Paris 1897. 30 frs.

Three or four years ago there was not in existence in any language a history of Greek Sculpture up to the level of our knowledge of the subject. At present we have histories of sculpture fully up to date in French, German and English. The appearance of the fourth edition of Overbeck, of the second volume of M. Collignon, and of Mr. Ernest Gardner's *Handbook* has given us three histories characteristic of the nations to which they belong. Overbeck's History, of which we are glad to learn that a translation is in preparation, is a work of wide learning, of great impartiality of view, and of infinite use to students who wish to master the literature of any part of the subject; but it is somewhat amorphous. Mr. Ernest Gardner's *Handbook*, though slight, is notable for its clear judgment, and its resolute effort to separate the trustworthy results of investigation from mere theories. The History of Collignon, which is our special business, is a very pleasing work, agreeably written, admirably illustrated, and generally shewing moderation and good sense.

This second volume begins with the sculptures of the Parthenon, and comes down to the Roman Age. The treatment of the Hellenistic Schools shews M. Collignon perhaps at his best: but in every part the student may be sure of finding clearness and good method, combined with a knowledge of the most recent literature.

I must however proceed to the more useful part of a critic's task, which lies not in general commendation, but in indicating differences of opinion and suggesting improvements. There is of course scarcely a page in any history of Greek sculpture which does not contain matter for discussion. Points for notice must therefore be selected somewhat at random.

In the interpretation of the sculptures of the Parthenon, M. Collignon follows Prof. Furtwängler somewhat closely, even to the identification of the figure of the west pediment, which has hitherto passed for a river-god, as the hero Buzyges. He strikes a new light, however, by comparing with the

seated deities of the Frieze the seated gods of the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi. Even the beginning of light from Delphi is welcome; it is really time that the world at large were taken more into the confidence of the French Explorers.

In the series of chapters from p. 187 to 306 a clear principle of arrangement is wanting. First comes a chapter on the artists of the transition from the fifth to the fourth century, in which chapter the author includes not only the sculptures of the heroum of Trysa, and the Nereid monument of Xanthus, which belong altogether to the fifth century, but also the works of such artists as Cephisodotus and Timotheus who belong wholly to the fourth. Then comes a chapter on Scopas; next one on Praxiteles; then we return to the companions of Scopas, all save Timotheus; 'Timothéos nous est déja connu.' This order is certainly confusing. The four artists of the Mausoleum are not kept together. Leochares is separated from Timotheus, and Cephisodotus from Praxiteles, who was very probably his brother.

In dealing with the Mausoleum M. Collignon is perhaps less satisfactory than in most chapters. He publishes a new restoration by M. Bernier, without giving any justification of it, and does not mention the very elaborate and carefully reasoned reconstruction of Mr. Oldfield. He retains the figures of Mausolus and Artemisia in the chariot which surmounts the building, although doing so drives him to maintain the very paradoxical view that the architect Pythius, as a sculptor, was 'un digne émule de Scopas.' No doubt the sculptor of the figure of Mausolus was on the level of Scopas, but the artist who sculptured the horses of the chariot was greatly inferior to Scopas. Pliny says that the latter were by Pythius: the presumption then is that the former was by another artist.

Like all recent writers M. Collignon regards the heads from Tegea as the best indication of the style of Scopas. Here he is doubtless right. But he can scarcely be right in regarding the unhelmeted head as that of Telephus, since considerations of space forbid us to place it near the centre of the pediment, nor would Telephus be unarmed in his conflict with Achilles. Also M. Collignon's description of the head of the Calydonian boar from the same temple as 'énergique et sobre' seems to me unfortunate. The head with its ox-like eye and meaningless surface is a standing proof how completely even great Greek artists could fail in representing animals with which they were unfamiliar. Its inferiority is most striking when it is set beside the boar of Florence.

I must content myself with mentioning only one other section of the book, that dealing with the artist Damophon. This sculptor has become a noted *crux* of archaeology, and it is very interesting to see how each new writer deals with him. In M. Collignon's treatment there is not perfect consistency between the judgments in detail and the final summing up. Of the three extant heads from the group by Damophon at Lycosura, two, those of Demeter and Artemis give, says M. Collignon, 'l'impression du style classique.' The third head, that of the giant Anytus, is rightly compared by M. Collignon rather with the Zeus of Otricoli, which he regards as a work of a contemporary of Praxiteles, than with the Laocoon. But the fragment of marble drapery found with the heads, and supposed to have belonged to the Demeter (though this is anything but certain), 'démontre, avec toute évidence, que Damophon a subi l'influence du goût hellénistique'; and on the evidence of this drapery alone, Damophon is assigned to the beginning of the second century B.C. I should be disposed to question this decision. The historical probabilities that Damophon worked in the time of the foundation of Megalopolis and the restoration of Messene by Epaminondas are so overpowering, that we must very closely scrutinize any archaelogical evidence on the other side. Messrs. Cavvadias and Kawerau maintain that the late architectural features of the temple of Despoena, claimed by Dr. Dörpfeld as of Roman age, belong really not to the construction of the shrine, but to a later reconstruction, when it had fallen into decay. Whether this view be defensible I have no means of deciding; but if it be so, then we may fairly suppose that the fragment of drapery belongs to this restoration; and that the three heads by Damophon really belong to the age which claims them on historical grounds and considerations of style, the middle of the fourth century.

A few criticisms of a more general kind may not be out of place. In two matters especially M. Collignon seems to proceed without sufficient caution.

Firstly in his treatment of the Plinian dates of great sculptors. It is fairly clear that Pliny under each Olympiad gives only one real assignment, that of the sculptor first mentioned; the rest of the names cited

are merely those of supposed contemporaries. Thus in assigning Scopas to Ol. 80 Pliny only asserts him to be roughly speaking a contemporary of Polycleitus, whose name comes first under that date: and in so doing he may very probably confuse the two artists of the name of Polycleitus. So also in assigning Cephisodotus (the younger) to Ol. 121 he only classes him at a contemporary of Eutychides whose name again comes first. M. Collignon, then is in no way justified (pp. 233, 448) in taking Ol. 80 as the time of the *birth* of Scopas and Ol. 121 as the *end* of the career of Cephisodotus. In both cases he takes the testimony of Pliny in a sense for which analogy cannot be found.

The second fault is perhaps the gravest in the book. In dealing with statues and busts M. Collignon often omits to set aside the restorations by which they have been completed, and as a rule disfigured. A notable instance is to be found at p. 42, where in describing the Laborde head, supposed to come from the Parthenon pediments, M. Collignon writes 'le nez est droit, la bouche entr' ouverte.' But nose, lips and chin are alike modern restorations. So at p. 486 the beautiful statue of Antioch seated is reproduced, without a hint that the head and upraised hand are modern. It is possible that through not *thinking away* the restorations M. Collignon may have been in some cases misled in the unfavourable opinions which he expresses as to some statues. For example we find at p. 539, 'on sent le style d'école dans ce Niobide qui, blessé au dos, et tombé sur les genoux, étend le bras droit avec désespoir.' But the head and right arm, the worst points in this figure, are modern: and probably the arm was not in the original extended. Again at p. 508 M. Collignon writes of a figure of a young Gaul at Venice that he is 'tombant à la renverse avec des gestes plus compliqués que heureux.' But as both the arms and much of the left leg of this figure are modern, the awkwardness of the attitude must not be laid altogether at the door of the Pergamene author. It may be suspected that in both cases the ancient sculptor has suffered in M. Collignon's estimation for faults which he would have been the first to condemn.

There is a phrase used by M. Collignon at p. 476 which I think singularly unfortunate. He writes in regard to the restoration of the Aphrodite of Melos 'Quant à choisir entre les innombrables restaurations où s'est exercée l'imagination des érudits, c'est affaire de goût personnel.' This is a kind of view which the archaeological student is only too ready to adopt: but it is a pity that M. Collignon gives it his authority. Rather the restoration of the Melian Aphrodite like all other restorations is a question of evidence and research, and of the study of the ways of Greek art in general. One might almost as well say that in Greek and Latin composition the usage of words is an 'affaire de goût personnel.'

M. Collignon's second volume being the first large work on Greek sculpture published since there has been time for the quiet consideration of Prof. Furtwänglers's *Meisterwerke*, it is interesting to see how far he has been influenced by that remarkable book. He has seldom followed Furtwängler in extreme or subversive views; but he has in many cases been led by him away from views previously current. In my opinion he has not always held the balance evenly, but sometimes attributed to the theories of Furtwängler a value in proportion rather to their attractiveness than their solid worth. However, it would be hard to consider this a defect in M. Collignon's book: he has taken a line almost inevitable, and at worst he can in the next edition let the pendulum swing back a little.

In this brief notice, I have dwelt more on matters in which I do not share M. Collignon's opinion than on the far more numerous and more important matters in which I agree with him. On the whole it is certain that his book is a valuable help to students in this country as well as in France. In concluding I wish to assure him of the gratitude of English archaeologists for so beautiful and valuable a work, written in a language which almost all educated Englishmen can read.

PERCY GARDNER.

M. THOMAS' *ROME.*

Rome et l'Empire aux deux premiers siècles de notre ère. By EMILE THOMAS, Professeur à l'Université de Lille (Librairie Hachette, 1897). 3 frs. 50.

IN this eminently readable book of less than 350 pages, M. Thomas has drawn upon various extensive repertories of detailed information on Roman antiquities and literature. His originality, which appears at every turn, consists first of all in the

guiding faculty of good taste and the happy preservation of a right perspective. But most happy of all was the original idea of disentangling from historical surveys of various sides of Roman life, just those points which came especially into prominence during the two first centuries of Imperial Rome. During these two hundred years, if at any time, there is material sufficiently abundant to be fashioned into a vivid picture of Roman life as a whole. Professor Thomas has achieved most interesting results and in the picture he gives us, we see side by side the varied and scattered activities, pursuits, interests and occupations of the Romans under the empire. But this is not all. He has subtly woven into every part of his picture those familiar, those indispensable notes given by the authors whom we have learned to love and admire. The book is one more limited in its scope than Bekker's Gallus, but the art and effect of it, within its range, is far more perfect.

Pompeii and all that we know through excavations there, naturally forms a conspicuous topic, and M. Thomas has been successful in compressing the leading facts about life in a Roman provincial town into his first chapter of 36 pages. His plan of the excavated portions of Pompeii is admirably clear, and must be taken in conjunction with a small plan of the whole surrounding country. Reference to these plans side by side with our author's description carries home various facts as to changes in the coast line, and their bearing upon the buried town, which are not always plainly and sometimes not even correctly stated in far more voluminous works. Our author is not led as others seem to have been to give a disproportionate attention to Pompeian wall-decorations and frescoes by the accidental fact that the best new work of recent date concerning Pompeii has been upon this by no means all-important subject. M. Thomas' account of the Roman forum is not quite so clear, but this is chiefly due to the omission of the points of the compass from M. Dutert's plan, which is reproduced. The description given in the text is admirable, but the reader may find it desirable to consult the plan given in Baumeister's Denkmäler in order to find his way easily.

M. Thomas has a very good chapter on the Palatine, with a very good plan. Since he adheres to the designations of the Palace of Tiberius and the Palace of Caligula for the remains at the north-western end, he no doubt would have much to say in their defence, if the scope of the present book allowed. Some believe that the house in which Tiberius was born was never in any sense a part of the imperial dwelling and that Caligula built nothing on the Palatine that could be called a palace or connected with the palatial substructures there found. Again there are minute questions as to just what was the Septizonium and just where the *domus Augustana* should be indicated on the plan. Richter indeed seems to make out a good case for attributing to Domitian the substructures, which on M. Thomas' plan bear the legend 'Palais d'Auguste.' But Richter's view only involves attaching that same legend to foundations shewn an inch further west on our author's plan. The total and interesting impression conveyed by M. Thomas is most faithful to the substance of what we know concerning the Imperial abode on the Palatine. It was not a cluster of independent buildings, like the Yildiz Kiosk of to-day, it was more like the Louvre and Tuileries, a connected aggregate of buildings, the result of various alterations, rebuildings and extensions, made under various emperors.

Turning to another chapter, we find the account of the great institution of the bath as a pastime and a social function under the rule of the emperors, particularly entertaining and satisfactory. Without saying that certain contemporary accounts of the gorgeousness of the great Thermae of Imperial Rome are overdrawn, our author lays stress upon the soberer and more trustworthy facts attested by excavation, and the resulting picture is admirable. Of course the remarkable article *Balnea* by M. Saglio in the Dictionary of Daremberg et Saglio has here been of great use.

But now, lest it be supposed that M. Thomas has given us a manual of antiquities or a geography of recent excavations and not a picture of Roman social ways, habits, tastes and fashions during the first two centuries after Christ, I should mention his delightful literary and social *aperçus* given here and there throughout the book, and forming a welcome change from the intent study of his plans of Pompeii, the forum and the Palatine. Nothing could be more charming, more like the best sort of *feuilleton* writing than the pages on Pompeian *graffiti*. His chapter on wills and legacy hunters is equally sprightly, and there is a touch of poetry in what he has to say of Roman country places. He evidently is not very fond of Seneca, but he treats Pliny the younger as a personal friend

might, and it is with a friend's not unsympathetic frankness that he says after exclaiming at six eating rooms mentioned by Pliny in his account of his own villa, that it would be difficult to understand why there should have been eight 'cabinets de travail' in this villa, were not Pliny its proprietor. 'Mais pour Pline,' he then adds, 'une villa est un cabinet ou il compose bien plus qu'une campagne ou il repose.' This same younger Pliny exercises a fascination upon our author who portrays him with a delicate and discriminating hand in the closing chapter of this book, as a typical Roman of imperial times.

It is by viewing Pliny from the proper angle, the angle that is determined by the rest of the book, that M. Thomas makes his treatment of him so fresh, so new and so fruitful for the purposes in hand. The same may be said of his treatment of Tacitus in his chapter on the Northern frontier, while the whole book gains a certain rare and exquisitely French flavour from the constant recourse had in the text and the footnotes to Montaigne and his inimitable judgments passed upon the Roman ways which he so loved. In the chapter on the northern frontier, M. Thomas concentrates his gaze on the barbarians who serve as a foil to the Romans so dear to Montaigne. He bids us look beyond the Roman frontier and tells us clearly the sort of part these strange and invincible peoples of the Rhine played in public thought and opinion at imperial Rome. The chapter on the army of Africa, on the other hand, is a very admirable picture of the life of a Roman legion. In this chapter the work of M. Cagnat is much drawn upon, and in general the vividness and charm which both M. Cagnat and M. Thomas infuse into this account of garrison life in Africa may serve to remind us of the special hold which French scholarship has recently been gaining upon Roman provincial life. Seldom has the direct reward of devoted archaeological work been more instantaneous than that quickening which has come to learning in France from the work of the last decade in Tunis and Algeria. Indeed, this year's first public meeting of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres was signalised by a remarkably interesting account of French work in the field.

In M. Thomas' book assiduous learning and a trained and native soundness of taste have fused into a harmonious whole the most recent discoveries of archaeology and his own fresh and personal appreciation of various great writers. In spite of his archaeological training M. Thomas' leanings are prevailingly literary, and this delightful book may serve to reassure the friends of literature who fear the now accomplished archaeological invasion of the classical domain.

Louis Dyer.

MEMPHIS AND MYCENÆ.

In his notice of my *Memphis and Mycenæ* in the *Classical Review* for last December, vol. 10, pp. 447–453, Mr. Myres deals first with Chapter V. on the connexion of Egypt with Greece, secondly with an Appendix, on the vases from Thera, thirdly with Chapter IV. on the Calendar, etc., and fourthly with Chapters I.–III. on Dynasties XII. and XVIII. to XXVI. I will take the points in the order he has chosen.

I. On the Tell el-Amarna question he has nothing of his own to say: he merely quotes from Mr. Petrie's book, *Tell el Amarna*. I reviewed that book in the *Classical Review*, vol. 8, pp. 320 ff, and pointed out that Mr. Petrie's assertions went far beyond the facts. And I also pointed out that what was described there as 'this earlier style of Ægean pottery' had been described in Mr. Petrie's former works as the later style that followed the period of geometric ornament; and that the pottery which was there assigned to Dynasty XVIII. at the beginning of the fourteenth century B.C., had been assigned in Mr. Petrie's former works to Dynasty XX. at the beginning of the eleventh century.

Mr. Petrie found vases of a certain kind at Gurob, and gave them a date of 1400–1350 B.C. But he failed to find any vases of the same kind at Tell el-Amarna in a mass of pottery to which he gave a similar date. So he started a theory that the people at Gurob, on the west bank of the Nile, imported their Ægean ware from the west of the Ægean *viâ* Libya, while their contemporaries at Tell el-Amarna, just across the river on the east bank, imported theirs from the east of the Ægean *viâ* Syria.

On the other hand, he did find at Tell el-Amarna a number of vases of a style that he assigned to 1100 B.C. in his description of the Tomb of Maket at Kahun. And he asserted that 'there was not a single object which could be dated later than about 1380 B.C.' in the mass of pottery in which he

found those vases. But he did not even start a theory to reconcile the dates.

Since then he has written[1]:—

'These deposits shew the details of manufactures of the time, and conclusively settle the date of the Maket tomb at Kahun to be of the same time as the scarabs in it—Tahutmes III.'

Compare this with what he said about this tomb before[2]:—

'The broad limits of age are (1) the scarabs which prove the earliest coffin to be after Tahutmes III. (2) The blue glass frog, which is probably of Amenhotep III. or IV. (3) The green and black glazed beads, particularly the ribbed ones, which were not made before Ramessu II. and the ribbing of which shews the first stage of the deep ribbing prevalent in the XXIInd dynasty. (4) There is no pottery here like that of the XVIIIth and early XIXth dynasty; no trace of blue paint, no hard white faced ware, no elegant forms; but on the contrary the pottery here is mostly unknown in Gurob, that is, down to the time of Merenptah. These successive evidences bring down the age of the burials here to at least after the reign of Ramessu II., after 1200 B.C. for the earliest limit of possible age . . . . . It is a curious feature that the scarabs must have been nearly all old ones when buried. The latest is of Tahutmes III., or 1450 B.C., and probably contemporary with him, by the style of it: whereas the character of the beads, of the pottery, and of the coffiin all shew that two or three centuries had elapsed since the scarabs were made.'

Seeing how flatly Mr. Petrie had contradicted himself on all important points of date and style, I came to the conclusion that it was unnecessary to discuss his statements. If they had stood alone, I could have considered them in my book as fully as I did in this *Review*. But so many uninstructed people have been at work at Egypt, that my book would be about ten times the size it is, if I had undertaken to discuss the trash that has been written on the subject.

The excavations at Tell el-Amarna yielded at least 160 pieces of Egyptian pottery that can be assigned with certainty to the time of Dynasty XVIII. These either have seals with the names of certain kings in hieroglyphic, or else endorsements with the names of those same kings in hieratic. And these were all found within the limits of the ancient city. The excavations also yielded 1341 pieces of Ægean pottery. But only 12 of these were found within the limits of the ancient city. The other 1329 were found upon a piece of ground at least a quarter of a mile away. At the same time about 100 broken rings, scarabs, etc., with cartouches of those kings, were found upon that piece of ground, while upwards of 200 were found within the limits of the ancient city.

These, I believe, are all the material facts. And they provoke two questions. 1. If the Ægean pottery is really of the time of Dynasty XVIII., how did it get separated so distinctly from that Egyptian pottery? 2. If it is not of that time, how did it get mixed up with those rings and scarabs? For my own part, I think it easier to find an answer to the second question than to find an answer to the first: but this is simply a matter of opinion. My protest is against the statement that these excavations show 'beyond all doubt' that the Ægean pottery is of the time of Dynasty XVIII.

Going on next to the Kahun pottery, Mr. Myres says that 'only four of the published fragments could be mistaken by anybody for any known fabric of Naukratite pottery.' As to the possibility of their being 'mistaken' for this, I may refer to a remark of Mr. Murray's, quoted with approval in these columns by Mr. Cecil Smith.[3] Mr. Myres says that Mr. Petrie 'distinctly states that they are neither Naucratite nor of any later style known to him,' and he gives a reference to Mr. Petrie's book, *Illahun*, p. 10. But that is not what Mr. Petrie says. His statement is that he knows the pottery of Dynastics XVIII. and XIX., XXII. to XXV., and XXVI., and of the Greek and Roman periods at Naukratis and Tanis; and that 'not one piece of these peculiar varieties has ever been found yet in any later period.' The statement does not refer to the Kahun pottery at all. Then Mr. Myres says that Mr. Petrie's conclusion 'is based on differences alike of the clay, the glaze, the paint, the forms of the vases, and the scheme of ornament.' Mr. Petrie only mentions the paint and scheme of ornament (p. 9) as showing that the pottery is 'non-Egyptian'; and on p. 10 he says:—'The main argument for a later date for this Aegean pottery is the fineness of the paste, and the high polish of the surface. No doubt these details appear like those of later times. But there is internal evidence contradicting a late date for these pieces.' The only 'internal evidence' that he adduces, is the shape of two of the vases—plate 1, figs. 12, 14—and these look very like the common *stamnoi* of the Greeks. But whatever value may be set on Mr. Petrie's statements, it is clear that Mr. Myres will do no good by claiming his authority for statements that he has not made.

[1] *Catalogue of a collection of antiquities from the temple of Koptos*, p. 11.

[2] *Illahun, Kahun and Gurob*, pp. 23, 24.

[3] *Classical Review*, vol. 6, p. 466, note 1.

Mr. Myres next asserts that 'the very fragments which are least unlike Naukratite ware have been lately recognized, by identity alike of clay, glaze, paint, form and ornament, as a local Cretan fabric.' But, even if this opinion were correct, it would not interfere with anything that I have said. I have not asserted that the pottery is 'Naukratite,' or made at Naukratis. My statement was:—'The pottery is mainly of the types that come to light at Naukratis and other places occupied by Greeks between 700 and 500 B.C.'

In support of his opinion Mr. Myres cites 'Myres, *Proc. Soc. Antiq.* N.S. xv. (1895) 273: cf. Mariani, *Mon. Ant.* vi. (1896) Pl. viii. 5.' Both the references are wrong. He will find his own paper in Series II. xv. 351–356. As for the other, Plate viii. gives two views of a wall, and has not a 5 in it. From what Signor Mariani says, I should imagine that Mr. Myres is referring to Plate ix. fig. 12, though I cannot imagine how that picture of a potsherd is going to advance the question. But here are Mr. Myres' own statements (p. 354) about the pottery he saw in the Museum at Candia:—

'The shapes of the vessels, like their decorations, point especially to a connection with Aegean civilization, and in particular with that of Thera. The shape of many of the vessels is characteristically Theraean, also is closely parallel, both in shape and scheme of ornament, to the Theraean pot. Similar forms are found in pottery from Syros, Antiparos, and Amorgos, and in marble from Naxos. The general character of the pottery of the Kamárais valley thus points to the conclusion that it represents a probably local and very specially developed industry, most nearly related to that of the primitive inhabitants of Thera, and more remotely to that of the other Cyclades, and of Mykenae.'

Apparently, the ratiocination is:—These vases from Crete are so very like the vases from other Ægean islands, that they can only have been made in Crete. Coming on p. 356 to their connexion with the Kahun vases, he say:—'The correspondence between Professor Petrie's lithographs and my own may not be very striking . . . . . I can only repeat that the two wares are almost identical.' This is not convincing.

His next statement is that 'this Cretan pottery is found in undisturbed Cretan tombs which contain scarabs of Egyptian fabrics which are characteristic of the XIIth Dynasty and no other.' In proof of this he cites 'Evans, *Cretan Pictographs*, 1895, Appendix; cf. p. 57 = *J. H. S.* xiv. p. 327.' The book has no Appendix. The scarabs are mentioned on 57 = 326; but on 56 = 325 Mr. Evans says that 'exact details of the excavation are wanting,' and in a note he adds:—

'Professor Halbherr has obligingly collected for me on the spot the following particulars of the find, that are all that are now obtainable . . . . . The deposit was accidentally discovered in 1887 at a small distance beneath the surface. The objects lay in a heap of bones and skulls, but no regular tomb was noted.'

That is Mr. Myres' authority for his statement that the scarabs and vases were found together in 'undisturbed Cretan tombs.' There was no regular tomb at all. As for the deposit being undisturbed, that is simply a conjecture. And it is only hearsay that the scarabs were found in this deposit with the vases.

There are no cartouches on the scarabs, by which to fix their date. But, according to Mr. Evans, the 'ornament and material' show that they belong to Dynasty XII. These are his reasons:—

'The amethyst scarabs with a plain face—intended to be covered with a gold plate—characteristic of this period of Egyptian art, are represented among the Phæstos relics by an example, on which—probably by an indigenous hand—three circles have subsequently been engraved. A more important specimen however is a steatite scarab with a spiral ornament peculiar to this period, to which also in all probability belongs a white steatite bead with a vegetable motive and a scarab with a hieroglyphic inscription.'

As for the argument from 'ornament,' I cannot help thinking that Mr. Evans was trifling with his readers when he stated that this spiral ornament is peculiar to that period. And, as for the argument from 'material,' it just amounts to this:—Amethyst scarabs with a plain face are peculiar to the Twelfth Dynasty: this amethyst scarab has an engraved face: nevertheless, the scarab was made then, and the engraving was done afterwards.

But suppose, for a moment, that these scarabs were made in Egypt in the time of Dynasty XII. To show that the pottery is also of that age, it would be necessary to prove that (1) the scarabs were brought across to Crete in the time of Dynasty XII., that (2) the amethyst scarab was engraved by that 'indigenous hand' in the time of Dynasty XII, and that (3) the scarabs were buried with those vases in the time of Dynasty XII. And there is not any proof of any of these points.

Mr. Myres quotes me quite correctly as speaking of 'the futility of arguing that things must date from the same period, if they happen to be discovered in the same

deposit.' But his comments on that statement are astonishing.

Thus, he says that 'Mr. Torr has still to show that the coffin of Pinetchem's grandson was not buried in an old tomb, and that part of the former equipment was not left lying there, or even used again for the new occupant.' That would be an admirable bit of criticism, if I had said exactly the reverse of what I did say.

Again, he says that 'Mr. Torr's argument brings us no nearer to a decision whether scarabs of Dynasty XVIII. have been dropped on a Mykenaean site, or Mykenaean fragments on one of Dynasty XVIII.' How could it?

Then again he says:—'If things which are discovered in the same deposit are not necessarily of the same date, what becomes of Mr. Torr's argument (p. 10) from the contents of the same vault in the Apis sepulchres, or (p. 25) from a collocation of mummies?'

There is no analogy at all between the cases. What Mr. Myres calls 'the contents of the same vault in the Apis sepulchres' are the mummies of two of the Apis bulls. And it is clear, from the arrangement of the sepulchres, that one of these bulls was the immediate successor of the other. As for the 'collocation of mummies,' to which Mr. Myres refers, it is simply a question of whether a certain mummy would have been transferred to the cave at Dehr el-Bahari, unless its owner had been closely connected with the kings whose mummies were preserved there. There is clearly no analogy between these cases and cases of 'deposits' of uncertain origin, or 'sites' on which things have casually been 'dropped.'

Passing to another subject, Mr. Myres says that 'in discussing the XVIIIth Dynasty scarabs, etc., found at Mykenae and Ialysos, Mr. Torr displays no knowledge of any mode of dating Egyptian objects except by their inscriptions.' And he adds that 'Mr. Torr seems to assume that a scarab is forged unless it can be demonstrated to be genuine. With our present knowledge of styles and fabrics the opposite assumption is at least equally tenable.'

When any one assigns a scarab to this or that Dynasty on grounds of 'style' and 'fabric,' he is really arguing thus:—The style and fabric of this scarab resemble the style and fabric of various other scarabs, which have inscriptions with the names of certain kings and queens. The dating by styles and fabrics has ultimately to rest upon the dating by inscriptions.

Now, a scarab might be inscribed with the cartouches of the reigning king and queen, or with those of any of their predecessors. And the scarab need not have been a 'forgery' because it named a by-gone king or queen.[1] But, manifestly, a scarab could not be inscribed with the cartouches of any future king or queen. A cartouche is conclusive evidence of the *terminus post quem*.

Thus we may be certain that such or such a scarab is not earlier than a given reign: but there is some risk in saying that it cannot be later than this reign, or that it cannot be so early. I quite admit that the date can generally be fixed, on grounds of style and fabric, with certainty enough to justify its use in catalogues, etc., where nothing turns upon it. But I do not believe that it can ever be fixed with certainty enough to justify its use in treatises on history or chronology.

Mr. Myres asserts that 'both at Mykenae and at Ialysos all the imported porcelain objects of recognisable fabrics are of XVIIIth or XIXth Dynasty styles.' In support of this assertion, he refers to *J.H.S.* xii. p. 273 ff., where nothing of the kind is said. And then he adds that 'the probability is thus proportionately strengthened that they were all imported within the period to which they belong in Egypt.'

The only cartouches that have come to light at Ialysos and Mycenæ, are those of queen Thii and her husband, king Neb-mat-Ra Amen-hetep of Dynasty XVIII. There are four of these, and they are all on porcelain objects. But other cartouches would assuredly have come to light, if the porcelain from these sites was really of recognisable fabrics of the XIXth as well as the XVIIIth Dynasty, and had really been imported at that period.

Mr. Myres also says that 'when scarabs of several kings are found together,.....they may be regarded as very probably fixing the date of the group in the place where it occurs.' And, as an instance of this, he mentions the discovery at Gurob of two objects with the cartouches of Neb-mat-Ra Amen-hetep and Neb-cheperu-Ra Tut-anch-Amen. But four objects with the cartouches of Neb-mat-Ra Amen-hetep and Thii have been discovered at Ialysos and Mycenæ. And, at this rate, the things from Ialysos and Mycenæ are assignable to a definite

[1] For instance, as Sir P. Renouf suggested long ago, the priests on royal 'foundations' may have chosen the cartouches of their 'pious founders' for the decoration of their rings and scarabs.

time in Dynasty XVIII.; and his recognition of XIXth Dynasty fabrics is unfounded.

But if he is wrong about the fabrics of Dynasty XIX., there is not much reason for crediting his judgment on those of Dynasty XVIII.

In speaking of queen Thii on p. 63 of my book, I made the remark that she 'was probably a foreigner[a]', with the foot-note '[a] See below, pp. 68, 69'; and there I pointed out what part of Syria she would have come from. Mr. Myres' comment is:—'But, in syllogistic form, *some foreigners are not Greeks.*'

II. The vases from Thera were found underneath a layer of pumiceous tufa; and the question is, when was this tufa formed? On this question Mr. Myres' remarks are open to practically the same objections that I took to M. Fouqué's.

M. Fouqué attributed all the pumice on the island to one vast eruption in prehistoric times. But, as I pointed out, we have it on record that pumice has been ejected in enormous quantities in historic times. In reply to that, Mr. Myres only says that this pumice 'cannot be identified,' and that 'Theophanes probably exaggerated the eruption of 726 A.D.' Theophanes seems tolerably precise in his account; and this eruption of 726 is not the only one on record.

But, although M. Fouqué placed the great prehistoric eruption at about 2000 B.C., Mr. Myres is ready to admit that it might have happened as late as the ninth or tenth century. And if that much is admitted, the question may as well be left.

After this, he returns for a moment to archæology: but I need only give one more sample of his work in that department. He says here: 'A statement is current that the golden cups from Vaphio represent the goldsmith's art of the seventh century.' For this statement he refers to an article published in the *Times* of Jan. 6, 1896, and reprinted in the *Academy* of Jan. 11. And here is the passage:—

'But incomparably the most important object in these finds is a small steatite scaraboid, on which is an intaglio design of a bull lying down. The work is very admirable, the drawing most masterly, recalling the famous Vaphio gold cups in the museum at Athens. From the shape of the stone and the technical skill employed, it is evident that this gem must belong to a very advanced period of Mycenæan art, possibly as late as 700 B.C.'

III. In speaking of the Sothic cycle of 1461 years, I pointed out that the dog-star did not really rise at intervals of exactly $365\frac{1}{4}$ days; and consequently the cycle did not really amount to four times $365\frac{1}{4}$ years, or 1461. And I added that a period, which ended at Alexandria in 139 A.D., would really have begun there in 1318, not in 1322 B.C.; and further south, at Thebes and Elephantine, the beginning and the ending would both have been considerably later, as the date of rising varies with the latitude.

Commenting on this, Mr. Myres says: 'Mr. Torr may set his mind at rest; for if he will consult any of the principal contributions to Egyptian chronology from Biot downwards—of whom he quotes not one throughout the chapter—he will see that these elementary astronomical facts have not been ignored in the calculation of the current chronology.'

The facts being elementary, there was surely no necessity for referring to any works in proof of them. As a matter of fact, however, one of Biot's works is cited in that chapter, p. 56, though not upon this point. In that work Biot[1] makes the Sothic period reach back from 139 to 1322: so Biot ignored the 'elementary astronomical fact' that this period began in 1318. Of the authorities 'from Biot downwards' only two are specified by Mr. Myres; and these are Mr. Petrie and Herr Mahler. But in the very passages that Mr. Myres cites, Herr Mahler ignores that other 'elementary astronomical fact' by omitting to allow for difference of latitude, while Mr. Petrie not only adopts the dating thus obtained, but also makes the Sothic period reach back from 139 to 1322.

Here is Mr. Myres' statement:—'Theon of Alexandria puts an "era of Menophres" in 1322 B.C. Menophres, of whom Mr. Torr knows nothing, may well be Men-peh-Ra (Ramesses I.) whose reign is dated 1328—1326 by downward reckoning from Mahler's date for Thothmes III. (cf. Petrie, *Hist. Eg.* ii. 33).

Herr Mahler gets his fundamental date[2] for Thothmes III. from an inscription in the Louvre[3]; and if that date is wrong, his reckoning collapses altogether. Now, this inscription was taken from a wall at

[1] Biot, *Recherches sur plusieurs points de l'astronomie Égyptienne*, p. 239, and folding-table thereto; also pp. 306–308.

[2] Mahler, *König Thutmosis III.—chronologische Bestimmung seiner Regierung*, in the *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Alterthumskunde* for 1889, vol. 27, pp. 97 ff.

[3] Engraved in Lepsius, *Denkmäler aus Ägypten*, part 3, plate 43 c.

Elephantine: but he makes no allowance for the latitude. He treats it as a record of the time of Thothmes III.: yet this is simply an assumption.[1] And in his calculations he assumes that it refers to the year of 365 days, though it may just as well refer to the year of 360. In short, his date for Thothmes III. depends on two assumptions and a blunder.

Mr. Petrie[2] writes as follows:—

'A tablet at El Bersheh (now destroyed) was dated in the 33rd year of Tahutmes III.—the year of the feast, according to Mahler; and—more precisely—on the 2nd day of Mesore, which is only three days after the feast day on the 28th of Epiphi. And in this tablet the beginning of a million of Sirius cycles is wished for the king. Such an allusion to the great feast in that year, which took place only three days before this, is a brilliant confirmation of Mahler's astronomical reckoning; for, were that erroneous in any point, it would be entirely wrong, and hopelessly unlikely to agree with such a record.'

The inscription in the Louvre is a fragment of a calendar; and this marks the 28th of Epiphi as the festival of the rising of Sirius. Of course, Sirius had to rise (heliacally) every year; but the great event was when this rising fell on New Year's Day, the 1st of Thoth. That marked the beginning of a Sothic cycle; and, by Herr Mahler's reckoning, no such rising could occur within 152 years of the date of this inscription. In the inscription from El-Bersheh, which Mr. Petrie cites, the text[3] starts with the date, the 2nd of Mesore in the 33rd year; and immediately after the date, comes the phrase which he translates as 'the beginning of a million of Sirius cycles.' This is not a statement of what was wished for the king: it is simply an addition to the date. And the date is the 2nd of Mesore, *not* the 28th of Epiphi.

Starting with Herr Mahler's date for Thothmes III., Mr. Petrie takes the lengths of the succeeding reigns from Manetho, and thus gets 1328—1326 for Rameses I. And then, although this date for Thothmes III. is calculated on the supposition that the Sothic period began in 1318, he puts the beginning of that period in 1322.

As for the identification of Menophres with Rameses I., that is based by Mr. Petrie on the likeness of the names Menophres and Men-peh-Ra. But the Greeks always spoke of the Egyptian kings by the *nomen*; and Men-peh-Ra is only a *prænomen*, the *nomen* being Rameses. With regard to Mr. Myres' allusion to Menophres "of whom Mr. Torr knows nothing," I need only say that I have duly mentioned this king on p. 56, and given in a footnote the passage in Theon, which is the only evidence of his existence.

Pursuing the subject, Mr. Myres says that 'Mr. Torr may be right or wrong in saying that the cycle of 1461 years was not calculated or applied to historical purposes till the Ptolemaic age: but that does not affect the question whether either Censorinus orMahler is justified in reckoning dates by the aid of it."

Censorinus only reckons that the hundredth year of one of these periods was current at the date at which he wrote, namely, 238 A.D. And this has nothing to do with the case. But neither Herr Mahler nor anybody else is justified in applying this method to dates as far back as the XVIIIth or XIXth Dynasties, for the requisite material does not exist.

Supposing that Sirius rose at Alexandria on the 1st of Thoth in 139 A.D., it rose there on the 1st of Thoth in 1318 and 2776 and 4236 B.C. So, if an inscription or papyrus notes the rising of Sirius on a certain day of a certain month, that inscription or papyrus can be placed so many years before or after one or other of these fixed dates, provided that (1) due allowance is made for difference of latitude, and (2) proof is given that the day and month are taken from the calendar of 365 days to the year.

Mr. Myres cites Herodotos, ii. 4, to prove the existence of a year of 365 days in the fifth century. That is rather a waste of time; as the point is that the year of 365 days was not the *only* kind of year in use some centuries before. But afterwards he says:—'A series of XVIIIth Dynasty documents shows that the date of the Sothic festival was systematically altered by seven days every thirty years and that this change was celebrated by a greater feast, the *Sed*-festival. In a series of twelve consecutive Sed-festivals, only three are unrepresented by extant inscriptions, and one of these falls in the 'heretic' reign of Akhenaten: and of the remainder five expressly note the month and day of the festival. Now these regularly recurring dates will not work out on any hypothesis but that of a year of 365 days.'

[1] Brugsch, *Drei Fest-Kalender*, p. vi., assigns this inscription to Thothmes III.; but in his *Reiseberichte*, p. 244, he assigns it to Rameses II. Unger, *Chronologie des Manetho*, pp. 193, 201, also assigns it to Rameses II. Riel, *Sonnen- und Sirius-jahr*, pp. 349 ff., assigns it to the Roman period.

[2] Petrie, *History of Egypt*, vol. 2, p. 31.

[3] Sharpe, *Egyptian Inscriptions*, second series, plates 33 and 47.

In reality Sothic cycles and Sed-festivals stand quite apart; and manifestly, if the date was altered by 7 days in every 30 years, the cycle would exceed the Sothic cycle by an entire century. As for the 'series of twelve consecutive Sed-festivals,' Mr. Myres has got the notion from Mr. Petrie,[1] who makes out the list as follows:—1, under Amenhotep I, year 9, Epiphi 9. 2, under Tahutmes I. 3, under Hatshepsut, year 16, Epiphi 21. 4, under Tahutmes III, year 33, Epiphi 28. 5, under Amenhotep II. 6, under Amenhotep II. 7, unrecorded. 8, under Tutankhamen. 9, unrecorded. 10, unrecorded. 11, under Ramessu II, year 41, Thoth 22. 12, under Merenptah, year 2, Thoth 29.

Supposing that the date was altered by 7 days on each occasion, it is clear that the third of these festivals would come 14 days later than the first, and that the eleventh would come 49 days later than the fourth. But here the first and third are placed on the 9th and 21st of Epiphi—an interval of only 12 days, or 2 days too little; while the fourth and eleventh are placed on the 28th of Epiphi and the 22nd of Thoth—an interval of 59 days, or 10 days too much. Moreover, with 365 days to the year, a period of 48 years would be required for the change of 12 days from the 9th to the 21st of Epiphi; and that gives an average of 24 years each for the intervals between these festivals. But a period of 236 years would be required for the change of 59 days from the 28th of Epiphi to the 22nd of Thoth; and that gives an average of 34 years each for the seven intervals between. And yet these festivals came regularly every 30 years.

The first date in the list—the 9th of Epiphi in the 9th year of Amenhotep I—is taken from a papyrus at Leipzig.[2] In a calendar in that papyrus the rising of Sirius is noted on this day. But the calendar proceeds from day 9 of Mesore (the 12th month) to day 9 of Thoth (the 1st month) just as it proceeds from day 9 of any other month to day 9 of the next; so that it clearly is intended for the year of 360 days with twelve months of 30 days apiece and nothing added at the end. And this year of 360 days has no connexion with the Sothic cycle. With regard to the fourth date in the list—the 28th of Epiphi in the 33rd year of Tahutmes III—I have already pointed out that there is nothing to connect this 28th of Epiphi with the year of 365 days, or even with the reign of Tahutmes III. It is needless to discuss the other dates.

Mr. Myres then refers to a calendar, of 365 days to the year, in an inscription of the IVth Dynasty; and says that this 'justifies the calculation of dates by astronomical methods under the Old Kingdom: where an inscription, which dates the Nile flood, and corresponds to 3350 B.C., gives a date of 3410 B.C. for the beginning of Dynasty VI., as against 3503 by dead-reckoning from the lists. (Petrie, *Hist. Eg.* i. 253).'

Of course, the question is not, whether the year of 365 days was in use in the time of the Old Kingdom, but whether it was the *only* kind of year that was in use then. As for those dates of 3350 and 3410 B.C., Mr. Petrie gets them in this way:—

> 'We know that when Una quarried alabaster at Hat-nub he did it in 17 days of the month Epiphi; and that yet he could not get it down to the pyramid before the Nile began to subside. There are some rather vague points about this, as the part of the month of 30 days in which the 17 fell, the time required to get down, which would perhaps be only 6 or 8 days, and the time of the Nile falling. Putting the fall at about November 5, the boat would have left Hat-nub about October 28; and the 17 days would be to October 11. Hence Epiphi would fall within 6 days of October 5 to November 5. This date would be that of Epiphi at about 3350 B.C., if we reckon the 1460 year periods back from 139 A.D. . . . . Having, then, 3350 B.C. for the reign of Merenra, and adding about 60 years, we reach about 3410 B.C. for the beginning of the VIth Dynasty.'

This curious argument all depends upon the statement that Una could not get the alabaster down to the pyramid before the Nile began to subside. But that is not what the inscription says. Its statement is that Una accomplished his task in spite of the deficiency of water.[3] There is nothing there to show whether the Nile was then beginning to subside, or had subsided several months before.

As for the 'dead-reckoning from the lists,' it seems to come to this:—The 'lists' are Manetho's lists of Dynasties and kings. It can be proved from the inscriptions that some of the Dynasties overlapped, and that the length of many of the reigns is given incorrectly. But it is assumed that none of the other Dynasties overlapped, and that the length of all the other reigns is given quite correctly. So the Dynasties are strung together, and the reigns are added up; and this is called 'dead-reckoning.'

[1] Petrie, *History of Egypt*, vol. 2, p. 32.
[2] Ebers, *Papyros Ebers*, tafel 1, rückseite.
[3] Lines 44, 45. The inscription is carefully discussed by Erman in the *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Alterthumskunde* for 1882, vol. 20, pp. 1 ff.

IV. In my book I have endeavoured to fix the dates in the only way in which they can be fixed with certainty: namely, by determining the true succession of the kings and the lengths of all their reigns. And starting with the conquest by Kambyses in 525 B.C., I have worked back, reign by reign, to the accession of Se-hetep-ab-Ra Amen-em-ha.

Mr. Myres says that my 'chronology is constructed from a number of official or semi-official documents, which give a continuous genealogy upwards from the accession of Psammetichos in 664 B.C. to the third year of Rameses Heq-mat-Ra.' And he says that this 'continuous genealogy' has fifteen generations. There is nothing of the kind in the book.

Then he says that I have brought down the accession of Heq-mat-Ra to 942 B.C., at latest, by eight 'ingenious methods' which he specifies. Three of the eight have no effect upon the dates.

(1) He says that 'no king is reckoned to have reigned longer than the last year of which a dated document is known to Mr. Torr.' Whenever I have used this method, I have taken care to say that the king reigned so many years *at least*, and came to the throne at such or such a date *at latest*; and in the Preface I have called attention to the fact that there may be dated documents that I have overlooked. But I have only used this method in cases where there is no evidence to fix the length of reign exactly.

(2) 'If a king seems to have reigned unreasonably long, he may be assumed to have reigned *de jure* and not *de facto*.' I need hardly say that I have not used this method with the reigns that might be thought 'unreasonably long,' the 54 years of a Thothmes, or the 67 of a Rameses. The question arises in another way. Inscriptions and documents of every sort were dated by the year of the king's reign. If we do not find a king's name in such datings until (say) the twenty-third year of his reign, we must face the alternative that every single record of the previous years has somehow been destroyed, or that the king had not reigned *de facto* all that while. And this is not a matter for assumptions, one way or the other. We have to weigh the probabilities in every case.

(3) 'If generations mount up provokingly fast, three or four successive occupants of a hereditary office may be assumed to have been brothers (p. 9): in spite of the fact that they all bear the title of Royal Son.'

This has no effect upon the dates. My chronology is founded on the lengths of the reigns. And three reigns, say, of 8 and 6 and 7 years, will cover the same period, 21 years, whether the kings are father, son and grandson, or three brothers in succession. On p. 9, to which Mr. Myres refers, I remarked that three kings might possibly be brothers; but I kept to the view that they really were father, son and grandson. There is no evidence that they had the title of Royal Son; but it would be strange if they had not.

(4) 'Similarity of name is good evidence of identity of person: *e.g.* Auapuat, royal son of Rameses, is identified on weak evidence with Auput, son of Hetch-kheper-Ra Sheshenk: two Nemarts and two Uasarkens are identified.'

In saying that two Nemarts and two Uasarkens are identified, Mr. Myres means that I take the Nemart, who is mentioned in one inscription, to be the same person as the Nemart who is mentioned in another; and the Uasarken, who is mentioned in one inscription, to be the same person as the Uasarken who is mentioned in another. I need hardly say that I have never treated similarity (or identity) of name as good evidence of identity of person, or treated it as evidence at all. It is simply a condition precedent to inquiry. One does not inquire whether the Nemart, who is mentioned in one inscription, is the same person as the Uasarken, who is mentioned in another. But when there are two inscriptions, each mentioning a Nemart, one inquires whether they refer to the same person or two different people.

As for Auput, or Auapuat:—An inscription shows that Auput was high priest of Amen in year 21 of king Hetch-cheper-Ra Sheshenk. Another inscription gives the title of Royal Son of Rameses to Auapuat, while another gives this title to the high priest of Amen in year 28 of king Sheshenk. In this inscription the king's *prænomen* is unfortunately missing: but the name of Hetch-cheper-Ra Sheshenk is given in full in the only other inscriptions that contain this title and specify the reigning king. The spellings, Auput, Auaput, Aupuat, and Auapuat, seem to have been used indifferently.

Mr. Myres goes on to say that 'if Skemiophris can represent Sebek-em-sas, Psusennes Pasebchanu, and Sivi Sabako, it is a little hypercritical to refuse Aquaiusha for Ἀχαιϝοί, as Mr. Torr does, ignoring the fact that this is only one of a long list of

equally close transliterations, and that the cogency of such a list is cumulative.'

Manetho, writing in Greek, uses the names Skemiophris and Psusennes, where he seems to be referring to Sebek-em-sas and Pasebchanu; and Assyrian inscriptions have the name Sibi, where they seem to be referring to Sabakon; but the Egyptian inscriptions that mention the Aqaiuasha, indicate that they were Libyan nomads—and that does not at all agree with what we know of the Achæans. I am glad to find that I have only to supplement Macedon and Monmouth by Sicily and Scilly, Skyros and Skye, and a few more equally close transliterations; and then the cogency of that list will be cumulative too.

(5) He remarks that 'personal names go in alternate generations in many Egyptian families,' and then speaks of my 'frequent use of this canon to piece fragmentary genealogies together.' In going over a period of about a thousand years, I have made four or five allusions to the regular recurrence of the names. But this does not affect my chronology, as that is founded on the lengths of the reigns.

(6) 'The unknown name of a brother may be recovered from the masculine form of the name of a woman whom it is convenient that he should have had as sister and as wife,' and he refers to page 7. As I stated there, a queen Ta-ta-Bast is described in an inscription as the mother of a king Uasark, and Manetho makes a king Osorcho (Uasark) the successor of a king Petubastes (Pa-ta-Bast). I suggested that Ta-ta-Bast might be the sister and wife of Pa-ta-Bast. But that suggestion has no effect on the chronology.

(7) 'The Apis was not an occasional prodigy, but the succession of Apis bulls was continuous.' On this point he asks two questions, 'how the new Apis was brought to birth so conveniently,' and 'why its birth was ever chronicled at all, if the date was fixed by the death of its predecessor.' The answers are (α) the new Apis had to be selected from the bulls that were born on the day after the death of the late Apis, and (β) the birth was chronicled, just as the king's accession was chronicled, although the day was fixed by the death of the king's predecessor on the previous day.

(8) 'If no Apis died in a king's reign, he was not recognised at Memphis—consequently all kings who failed to survive an Apis form parallel Dynasties with those who succeeded in doing so.' I need hardly say that I have not manufactured Dynasties in this or any other way. My point was:—There is no record of the death of an Apis in the reigns of any of the kings of Dynasties XXI. and XXIII. And that is one of the reasons why XXI. and XXIII. are treated as 'parallel' Dynasties that were not recognized at Memphis.

After this he says that 'Dynasties XIII.—XVII. are extinguished utterly; so that Amenemhat (Mat-cheru-Ra) of Dynasty XII. is placed in the generation immediately above Ahmes of Dynasty XVIII.' It seems clear, from the inscriptions cited in my book, that this Ahmes came next to this Amenemhat in the legitimate succession; so that the Dynasties that have been numbered XIII. to XVII. did not really come between the Dynasties that have been numbered XII. and XVIII. But those Dynasties are not 'extinguished utterly': they are treated as concurrent.

In conclusion he makes further comments on a genealogy that has already been mentioned. But, as I said before, this genealogy is simply an invention of his own.

CECIL TORR.

[A rejoinder from Mr. Myres only arrived as this number was going to press, and is held over for March. G.E.M.]

MONTHLY RECORD.

ITALY.

Taranto.—The works for the new buildings of the Borgo Nuovo have brought to light a hoard of silver vessels of remarkable workmanship and of peculiar interest for the history of industrial art in Magna Graecia. It includes two dishes with half-figures in relief in the centre, representing Dionysos and a Maenad; a cup decorated with Erotes and a garland of leaves and fruit; a stand for a crater with ornaments of ox-skulls and flowers; and a large pyxis with a richly-decorated cover, on which are figures in repoussé: a Victory crowning a warrior and an Ephebos standing by. Some of the figures have been gilded, and on the cup rubies are worked into the fruit. The treasure was found beneath a Roman mosaic pavement, and was probably buried in late Hellenistic times.[1]

SICILY.

Tyndaris.—Excavations under the direction of the Palermo Museum have unearthed a fresh portion of the colossal walls of the city and numerous tombs. On some of the large limestone blocks forming the wall are letters, probably intended for masons' marks. The tombs are not of very ancient date; some were rich in gold ornaments and engraved stones. On several of the skulls were crowns of thin gold leaf, and in the mouths were found small gold discs, evidently the passage-money for the voyage over the Styx; on some of them is a figure of a boat.[2]

[1] *Athenaeum*, 21 Nov. 1896.
[2] *Ibid.* 12 Dec. 1896.

GREECE.

Athens.—In the Dipylon the Athenian Archaeological Society has discovered the ancient road leading to the Academy, and also remains of a building supposed to be the temple of Artemis Kalliste. Inscriptions were found with decrees relating to a priest of this goddess.[3]

AFRICA.

Tunis (*Susa.*)—A small mosaic has been discovered, well executed and in good condition, on which is represented a beardless man in a white toga with blue border, seated and holding an open roll in his lap, on which are visible the words: 'Musa mihi causas memora, quo numine lae[s]o Quidve' . . . (*Acn.* i. 8). On the right is Clio, reading from a roll, on the left, Melpomene, with a tragic mask. The man is identified as Virgil, writing his Aeneid. Such portraits of Virgil are not uncommon in MSS., and all are very much alike, probably derived from one original. This mosaic dates from the first century of our era, and is probably a copy of a well-known portrait, perhaps that mentioned by Martial.[4]

Jahrbuch des deutschen archaeologischen Instituts. Band xi. Drittes Heft. 1896.

M. Meurer: Das griechische Akanthusornament und seine natürlichen Vorbilder. 54 cuts. Treats of the acanthus ornament in the fifth century and its influence on the subsequent art of the West, and investigates its relations to the plant itself in its origin and development. The earliest forms are derived from the lower leaves round the root; illustrations given from stelae on lekythi and examples in sculpture; further developments, including the Corinthian capital, from the leaves growing round the stem. It is uncertain whether the original was the *A. spinosus* or *A. mollis.*

J. J. Bernoulli: Ikonographisches: ii. Die Bildnisse des Homer; four types distinguished and discussed. iii. Die Bildnisse des Sophokles; three types discussed; bronze head in Brit. Mus. published. Plate; seven cuts.

F. Hauser: Eine Sammlung von Stilproben griechischer Keramik. 33 cuts. Describes his collection of fragments representative of various styles, chiefly b.f. and r.f.; also a few complete vases.

A. Kalkmann und E. Petersen: Zur Statue von Subiaco. 4 cuts. K. criticises an article by Körte in the present volume and defends his own views as given in a previous article. P. attempts a restoration as an athlete engaged in some game of lassoing, and connects with the statue a hand found with it containing part of a cord. The existing statue a marble copy of a bronze original, and not later than the fourth century.

Anzeiger.—Obituary notice of E. Curtius. Stele of Anaxandros found in 1895 at Sizepol (Apollonia) described and illustrated; recalls that by Alxenor. Report on Museum at Sophia. Meeting of Institute. Acquisitions of Brit. Mus. Catalogues of casts and photographs for sale at Munich. Bibliography.

H. B. WALTERS.

[3] *Athenaeum*, 9 Jan. 1897.

[4] *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 26 Dec. 1896.

Numismatic Chronicle. Part iii. 1896.

G. Macdonald. 'On a find made in the Lipari Islands, including an unpublished coin of Rhegium.' 63 Greek silver coins found in a pot in Vulcano, the ancient Hiera and probably buried *circ.* B.C. 260. The coins are principally of Neapolis and Tarentum. —Sir John Evans. 'Roman coins found at Brickendonbury, Hertford.' 432 coins found in 1895, Commodus to Herennius Etruscus.—Mrs. Bagnall-Oakley. 'A hoard of Roman coins found at Bishop's Wood, Ross-on-Wye.' 17,550 coins, all, except three, 'third brass' of the Constantine series. A map is given (Pl. XIV.) showing the localities in the neighbourhood of the Forest of Dean where Roman coins have been discovered.—J. E. Pritchard. 'Notes on a find of Roman coins near Cadbury Camp (Clevedon), Somersetshire.' Thirty-five 'third brass' coins, Gallienus to Constantius Chlorus.

Revue suisse de la Numismatique. 1896.

F. Imhoof-Blumer. 'Zur Münzkunde Kleinasiens.' *Aninetos.* A list of its coins, which are autonomous (second cent. B.C.) and Imperial. The coins rather indicate that this town lay in the southern part of Lydia near the Carian border. *Apollonis* (Lydia). *Stratonicea Hadrianopolis on the Caicus.* A list of its coins, which are to be distinguished from those of the Carian Stratonicea. Imhoof-Blumer assigns to the former place the specimens reading ΙΝΔΕΙ and ΙΝΔΙ . ΠΕΔΙΑΤΩΝ and conjectures that 'Ινδι . . . was the name of the town previous to the time of Eumenes II. when it was called Stratonicea. The Πεδιᾶται would thus be the inhabitants of the πεδίον 'Ινδι . . . *Tripolis.* A list of coins of Tripolis in Lydia on the right bank of the Maeander. An autonomous coin reading ΛΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΑΤΩΝ (type, Rider, on maeander pattern) previously assigned by Imhoof-Blumer to Apollonia Salbace in Caria is now attributed by him to Tripolis. If this attribution is correct, it follows that Tripolis, before the time of Augustus, bore the name of Apollonia (cp. Ramsay, *Cities and bishoprics of Phrygia*, i. p. 192).

Revue Numismatique. Part iii. 1896.

J. Rouvier. 'Une métropole phénicienne oubliée: Laodicée métropole de Canaan.' Suggests that coins bearing the Phoenician inscription 'Laodicea metropolis of Canaan' belong to Berytus under that name. (to be continued). *Chronique.* 'Fabrication des monnaies dans les temps anciens.' A brief criticism of Mr. Talfourd Ely's paper 'The process of coining as seen in a wall-painting at Pompeii (*Numismatic Chronicle* 1896, p. 53). The writer contends, on grounds that do not appear to me to be convincing, that a jeweller's workshop is represented and not a mint.

WARWICK WROTH.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik. Vol. 153. Parts 9, 10. 1896.

Die dreiseitige basis der Messenier und Naupaktier zu Delphi, H. Pomtow. Continued. Here the writer deals with the cause and date of the erection and gives a chronological account of the Messenians in Naupaktos. In consequence of the discovery of a new side of a block his conclusions are somewhat modified and a new dating of both memorials is made. Finally the text of some of the inscriptions is given with notes. *Zu Ovidius*, H. Crämer. In Ex Ponto iv. 16, 33 proposes *Tityrus antiquas pastorque rediret ad herbas*. *Die chronologie Diodors*, F. Reuss. The object of Diodorus was to write a continuous history of the world year by year, but the task exceeded his powers. The writer points out some of his chronological errors. *Zu Livius*, F. Reuss. Critical notes on some passages in Books I., II., XXI., XXII. *Der rückmarsch des Xerxes*, H. Welzhofer. When Herodotus wrote his history, the history of the Persian wars had become partly mythical. *Zu Theophrastos περὶ φυτῶν ἱστορίας*, H. Stadler. On the word *κράμβη* in i. 3, 1. *Zu Plautus Aulularia*, A. Fleckeisen. On ll. 120-177. In 159 reads with C. F. W. Müller *sed és tu natu grandior; mediást mulieris aétas*. *Zu Caesar*, J. H. Schmalz. In B. G. i. 40, 14 reads *an timor solus valeret* for *a. t. plus v.* *Der untergang der Fabier am Cremera*, E. Hoffmann. On Ovid Fasti ii. 195 foll. *Ueber die congruenz bei Caesar*, J. Lange.

Part 11. *Zur Griechischen geschichte* 411-404 *vor Chr.*, G. Friedrich. Chiefly with reference to Xenophon's Hellenica [Cl. Rev. vol. x. p. 406]. *Sokrates and Xenophon, II.*, K. Lincke. The only philosophical portions of Bks. I.–III. are iii. cc. 8, 9 in which Sokrates analyses certain general notions, as the good, the beautiful, etc. *Zu Protagoras περὶ θεῶν*, K. Lincke. In the text of Diog. Laert. (ix. 51) reads *περὶ μὲν θεῶν οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν* (for *εἰδέναι*). *Die dreiseitige basis der Messenier und Naupaktier zu Delphi*, H. Pomtow. Concluded from the last number. The time and occasion of sending a body of Messenians to protect the shrine at Delphi cannot yet be determined, owing to delay in the publication of an inscription. The writer collects the materials at present available. *Noch einmal zu Tacitus* ab exc, i. 64, F. Knoke. Defends *neque librare pila inter undas poterant* of the codd. [Cl. Rev. vol. x. p. 455]. *Studien zu Antigonos von Karystos, II.-V.*, R. Nebert. Maintains that the writer of paradoxes, the historian, the traveller, and the writer on art of this name were one and the same person [Cl. Rev. vol. ix. p. 429]. *Zu Ciceros briefen an Atticus*, Th. Stangl. In v. 12, 2 reads *vir gnarissimus* for *v. gravissimus*, and in xiii. 22, 4 *quae iniquo* (for *inimico*) *animo ferant*. *Zu Livius*, J. Franke. In xxii. 50, 1 maintains the integrity of the text against K. Liebhold who would insert *sors* after *alterius morientis* [Cl. Rev. vol. x. p. 174]. *Zu lateinischen anthologie*, J. Ziehen. Critical notes on (1) a couplet of Symphosius, (2) the second epigram of Vossianus Q 86 c. 418 (Riese), (3) c. 443 (Riese). *Ein neues dichter-fragment bei Cicero*, B. Nake. Finds a quotation from a comedy in frag. 5, 1 of Cicero's speech *in P. Clodium et C. Curionem* and would read it thus *quém decet ornátus muliebris, quem incessus psáltriae.*

Rheinisches Museum. Vol. 52. Part 1. 1897.

Der prodigiorum liber des Julius Obsequens, O. Rossbach. Of the later editors of Livy only H. J. Müller includes Obsequens. It is here maintained, as against Mommsen, that Obsequens was not a Christian. *Ueber den Cynegeticus des Xenophon, II.*, L. Radermacher. Continued [Cl. Rev. vol. x. p. 455]. In this part the language is treated and the conclusion is drawn that it is a genuine piece of Asiatic oratory, not earlier than the third century B.C. *Die Begründung des Alexander—Ptolemäerkultus in Aegypten*, J. Kaerst. We find in the history of the Ptolemaean monarchy the same traits which are found in the other dynasties sprung from the monarchy of Alexander. The adoration leads to a widening and accumulation of ceremonies which in time become merely formal. *Die Ueberlieferung von Aeli Donati commentum Terentii*, P. Wessner. Gives an account of the mutual relations of the principal codd. *Die Bukoliasten*, E. Hoffmann. Upon the various origins ascribed to the shepherd's song. *Delphische Beilagen*, H. Pomtow. Continued from the last number [Cl. Rev. vol. x. p. 455]. III. The activity of the Alkmaeonidae in Delphi.

Miscellen. *Vergiliana*, O. Immisch. (1) Aen. iv. 39 foll. transposes 40 and 41, (2) on vi. 518. *Zum Carmen de bello Actiaco*, M. Ihm. On resemblances herein to Vergil and Ovid. *Handschriftliches zu Germanicus' und Ciceros Aratea*, M. Manitius. *Sechzehnsilbige Normalzeile bei Galen*, H. Schoene. *Ein neues Fragment aus Lydus' Schrift de Ostentis*, C. Wachsmuth. Published from Cod. Paris. suppl. gr. 20.

Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik. Vol. 10. Part 2. 1896.

Zur Bildung und Erklärung der römischen Indigeten-Namen, Fr. Stolz. *Meminens. Mentio=mentior. Salūus. Minerŭa. Latona*, L. Havet. *Meminens*, used by Plaut., appears in late authors as well as infin. *meminere*. Perhaps we should read *meminens* for *meminisset* in Mil. 888. As Priscian quotes *mentior* as having both an act. and depon. form in early Latin we should perhaps read *mentibitis* in Mil. 254. As resolved forms are found in comedy we should probably read in Bacch. 893 *Minerŭa Latona*. *Die Entwicklung des Infinitivus historicus*, E. Wölfflin. Considers how the use of this construction has changed from Plaut. to late Latin, and whether it has absolutely died away in Latin. *Ergenna*, E. Lattes. Besides the Lat.-Etr. word *ergenna* = sacerdos may be put the Etruscan priestly title *erce ercem ercefás*. *Zur lateinischen Glossographie* ii., O. Schlutter. *Tesquitum*, E. Wölfflin. This word = *tesquetum* and is derived from *tesqua*, like dumetum from dumus etc. *Der Accusativ der Beziehung*, G. Landgraf. (1) After adjectives (and substantives), (2) after passive verbs. This construction is chiefly poetical, beginning with Vergil. The only pre-classical example is Plaut. Pseud. 785 *manus gravior*. *Nugas* = *nugax*, G. Landgraf. (1) *nugas* is an elliptical accus. from *nugae*, (2) used in the plur. (*nugae*) like *λῆρος* in Greek, of persons, (3) a popular form of the adj. *nugax*, (4) an indeclinable adj. *Vulgarlatcinisches bubia, graba*, W. M. Lind-

say. *Bubia* = 'man's breast,' *graba* = caput, whence *grabatum*. *Die Ellipse von ars*, J. C. Rolfe. Gives a list of the adjectives used as substantives by an ellipse of *ars*. *Muncrarius*, E. Wölfflin. A word first used by Augustus (Quintil. viii. 3, 34). *Bemerkungen über den Sprachgebrauch der Kaiserkonstitutionen im Codex Justinianus*, H. Krüger. The following words are selected for treatment *ambages, ambiguus* and *ambiguitas, aperio, apertius* and *apertissimus, appellatorius, attamen, elogium, evidentissimus*. *Die medizinischen Rezepte in der Miscellanea Tironiana*, C. H. Moore. *Sub divo columine*, F. Leo. Means lit. 'beneath the sky and the height.' *Columen* = the roof of a hall. In Mostell. 765 for *sub sudo columine* we should read *sub diu columine*. *Nucula : somnia*, G. Landgraf. *Nucula* is a neut. plur. = *nugula*, the dimin. of *nugae*. *Somnia* is used in the sense of *nugae*. *Die Alliteration tectus —tutus*, Köhler. *Galbanus, Galbianus*, E. Wölfflin. The form *Galbianus* took the place of *Galbanus* by false analogy. *Eques* = *equus*, E. Wölfflin. We have in the Ciceronian time a case of *eques* = *equus* and several in late Latin. There are also specimen articles *acervalis—acervus* by P. Menge, and *Acesis—acetum* by O. Hey.

MISCELLEN. *Salveto*, L. Havet. This word is not quite the same in use as *salve*, being generally restricted to answering a salutation. *Zum metaphorischen coquere*, A. Köhler. *A und ab in der Historia Augusta*, K. Lessing. The exceptions to the common rule that *ab* is found before vowels and *h*, and *a* before consonants are here enumerated. *Modo si*, H. Blase. Is an archaism as = *si modo* rather than an Africanism. Examples occur in Plautus, Ovid, Propertius. *Viride Appianum*, W. v. Gümbel. *Appianum* is a geographical name like *viride Hispanicum*, and is not derived from a person.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN BOOKS.

Armenian Apology: Acts of Apollonius and other monuments of early Christianity, with introduction and notes. By F. C. Conybeare. 2nd edition, with appendix. 8vo. 370 pp. Sonnenschein. 6*s*.

Harding (B. F.) The strong and weak inflection in Greek, with a short appendix on Latin inflection. 12mo. iv, 65 pp. 55 cts.

Mayor (J. B.) Guide to the choice of classical books. New supplement, 1879–1896. Crown 8vo. xxv, 128 pp. Nutt. 4*s*.

Middleton (G.) and T. R. Mills. Students' companion to Latin authors, introduced by W. M. Ramsay. Crown 8vo. 396 pp. Macmillans. 6*s*.

Plautus. Asinaria. From the text of Goetz and Schoell, with introduction and notes by J. H. Gray. 12mo. 166 pp. Cambridge University Press. 3*s*. 6*d*.

—— Pseudolus, with introduction and notes by H. W. Auden. 12mo. 184 pp. Cambridge University Press. 3*s*.

Ramsay (G. G.) Latin Prose Composition. 4th edition. Vol. I. (Syntax, Exercises with notes, Vocabulary, Appendix). 12mo. 332 pp. Clarendon Press Series. 4*s*. 6*d*.

Sophocles. The seven plays in English verse, by Lewis Campbell. New Edition. 8vo. 422 pp. Murray. 10*s*. 6*d*.

Tacitus. Histories. Book I., with introduction, notes, and index, by G. A. Davies. 12mo. 210 pp. Pitt Press Series. 2*s*. 6*d*.

Tibullus and Propertius. (Selections), with introduction and notes, by G. G. Ramsay. 2nd edition. 12mo. 450 pp. Clarendon Press Series. 6*s*.

Watkins (M. G.) Gleanings from the natural history of the Ancients. 8vo. 274 pp. Stock. 3*s*. 6*d*.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

Aeschyli. Dramata quae supersunt, ed. N. Wecklein. Vol. II. (Prometheus, Supplices, Fragmenta). 8vo. 648 pp. Athens. 10 fr.

Anonymus Londinensis. Auszüge eines Unbekannten aus Aristoteles, Menons, Handbuch der Medizia und aus Werken anderer älterer Ärzte griechisch herausgegeben von H. Diels. Deutsche Ausgabe von H. Beckh und Frz. Spät. 8vo. xxiv, 110 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 3 Mk.

Aristophanis. Ranae, cum prolegomenis et commentariis ed. J. van Leeuwen. 8vo. v, xx, 227 pp. Leiden, Sijthoff. 6 Mk.

Berliner Studien. See Hodermann, Heisterbergk, Valerius Flaccus.

Binder (Jos. Jul.). Mykenae und Troia 8vo. 27 pp. Engravings. Laibach. 50 Pf.

Caesar. Vulić (N.) Historische Untersuchungen zum Bellum Hispaniense. 8vo. 62 pp. München.

Callimachus. Dittrich (E.) De Actiis Callimacheis. 8vo. 38 pp. Leipzig.

Cicero. Kubik (Jos.) Realerklärung und Anschauungsunterricht bei der Lectüre Cicero's. 8vo. 66 pp. Vienna. Hölder. 1 Mk. 50.

Demosthenes. Die olynthischen und philippischen Reden nebst der Rede über den Frieden, erläutert von H. Windel. Text. 12mo. xxviii, 104 pp. Bielefeld. 1 Mk. 20.

—— the same. Kommentar. 12mo. 46 pp. Bielefeld. 60 Pf.

—— Helmke (Guil.) De Demosthenis codicibus quaestiones selectae. Part I. 8vo. 41 pp. Berlin, Mayer & M. 1 Mk. 50.

Dieterich (Albr.) Die Grabschrift des Aberkios, erklärt von D. 8vo. vii, 55 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 50

Dimitsas (Marg.) Historical, topographical, and archaeological description of Macedonia (containing 1,419 Greek and 189 Latin inscriptions). 8vo. 1,046 pp., plates and engravings. Athens. £1 4*s.*

Diognetus. Heinzelmann (W.) Der Brief an Diognet 'die Perle des christlichen Altertums.' Uebersetzt und gewürdigt. 8vo. 32 pp. Erfurt.

Dio Prusaensis. Graf (M.) In Dionis Prusaensis orationes ab J. de Arnim editas. I. Coniecturae et explanationes. 8vo. 32 pp. München.

Dioscorides. Kaestner (H.) Kritisches und Exegetisches zu Pseudo-Dioskorides de herbis femininis. 8vo. 64 pp. Regensburg.

Dissertationes philologicae Halenses. Vol. xiii, pars 3. (H. Wulf, De fabellis cum collegio septem sapientium conjunctis quaestiones criticae.) 8vo. 45 pp. Halle, Niemeyer. 1 Mk. 60.

Dörpfeld (W.) and E. Reisch. Das griechische Theater. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Dionysos-Theaters in Athen und anderer griechischer Theater. 4to. xv, 396 pp. 12 plates (1 of them coloured). Athens. Barth and H. 12*s.*

Dyroff (A.) Uber die Anlage der stoischen Bücherkataloge. 8vo. 55 pp. Würzburg.

Ettlinger (E.) Der sog. Anonymus Mellicensis de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis. 8vo. 105 pp., 2 plates. Strassburg.

Euripides. Schultze (O.) Disquisitiones Euripideae ad recensionem posterioris ordinis fabularum pertinentes. 8vo. 33 pp. Berlin.

Eusebius. Violet (B.) Ueber die palästinischen Märtyrer des Eusebius von Cäsarea. 8vo. 53 pp. Strassburg.

Fischbach (O.) Silbermünzen der römischen Republikaus Steiermark. 8vo. 166 pp. Engravings. Graz. Leuschner. 70 Pf.

Fitch (Ed.) De Argonautarum reditu quaestiones selectae. 8vo. 77 pp. Göttingen. Horstmann. 2 Mk.

Froelich (G.) Quatenus in nominibus hominum Doricorum propriis historici Graeci formis dialecticis usi vel Atticam dialectum secuti sint. I. 4to. 23 pp. Insterburg.

Furtwängler (A.) Uber Statuenkopieen im Alterthum. I. 4to. 64 pp. Engravings. 12 plates. München.

Goetz. Ueber Dunkel- und Geheimsprachen im späten und mittelalterlichen Latein. 8vo. 31 pp. Leipzig.

Gregorius Nyssenus. Burkhard (C. J.) Gregorii Nysseni (Nemesii Emeseni) περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου liber a Burgundione in latinum translatus. Cap. V.—XXV. 8vo. 31 pp. Wien.

Habich (G.) Die Amazonengruppe des attalischen Weihgeschenks. I. 8vo. 40 pp. 6 engravings. München.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, herausgegeben von Iwan von Müller. Vol. III., pt. 5. See Niese.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. See Krumbacher.

Hanne (F.) Das byzantinische Lehrgedicht Spaneas nach dem Codex Vindobonensis Theolog. 193. 8vo. 18 pp. Wien.

Hauler (E.) Eine lateinische Palimpsestübersetzung der Didascalia apostolorum. 8vo. 54 pp. Wien.

Heisterbergk (B.) Die Bestellung der Beamten durch das Loos. 8vo. iii, viii, 119 pp. (Berliner Studien XVI, 5). Berlin. Calvary. 3 Mk. 50.

Hodermann (M.) Quaestionum oeconomicarum specimen. 8vo. 51 pp. (Berliner Studien XVI, 4). Berlin. Calvary. 1 Mk. 50.

Homerus. Gedichte. Hilfsbuch, Vol. I. Metrik. Grammatik. Realien zur Odyssee. Bearbeitet von O. Henke. 8vo. xiv, 232 pp., map. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk.

—— Ludwich (A.) Homerica (VII—XII). 4to. 32 pp. Königsberg. 50 Pf.

—— Schelling (H. v.) Die Odyssee, nachgebildet in achtzeiligen Strophen. 8vo. viii, 512 pp. München. Oldenbourg. 6 Mk.

—— Seelisch. Der Homerische Hymnus an Demeter. 8vo. 12 pp. Erfurt.

—— Streinz (F.) De Necyia Homerica. 8vo. 21 pp. Klagenfurt.

—— Week (F.) Homerische Probleme. 4to. 40 pp. Metz.

—— Zutt (G.) Homerische Untersuchungen. 4to. 20 pp. Baden-Baden.

Hoppe (Feod.) Bilder zur Mythologie und Geschichte der Griechen und Römer. Folio. 30 plates. In Portfolio. Wien, Graeser. 14 Mk.

Hoppin (J. C.) Euthymides. 8vo. viii, 42 pp. 11 Engravings. Plates. München.

Horatius. Für den Schulgebrauch bearbeitet von H. Röhl. 12mo. xii, 226 pp. Bielefeld. 1 Mk. 80.

—— Matijević (N.) De Q. Horatii Flacci carminum I, 3, 4, II, 2 exteriori, quae dicitur, forma, disputatio. 8 vo. 42 pp. Spalato.

—— Raiz (Aeg.) Die Frage nach der Anordnung der horazischen Oden. 8vo. 14 pp. Graz. Leuschner. 70 Pf.

Jacoby (K.) Anthologie aus den Elegikern der Römer, für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Part IV. Ovid. 2nd Ed. 8vo. iii, 88 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk.

Jurisprudentiae antehadrianae quae supersunt ed. F. P. Bremer. Pars I. Liberae rei publicae juris consulti. 12mo. v, 424 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 5 Mk.

Jüthner (Jul.) Uber antike Turngeräthe. (Abhandlungen des archaeol-epigr. Seminars in Wien. Part XII.) 8vo. 101 pp. 75 Engravings. Vienna. Hölder. 6 Mk.

Keiffer (J.) L'esclavage à Athènes et à Rome d'après les auteurs grecs et latins. 4to. 52 pp. Luxembourg.

Kentenich (G.) Analecta Alexandrina. 8vo. 32 pp. Bonn.

Klein (F.) Ueber die Alliteration bei den lateinischen Schulautoren und deren Übersetzung. 8vo. 12 pp. Brünn.

Krumbacher (K.) Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur von Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches. 2nd edition. Edited with the assistance of A. Ehrhardt and H. Gelzer. (Handbuch der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft. Vol. IX, 1). 8vo. xx, 1123 pp. Munich. Beck. 24 Mk.

Lattmann (H.) De coniunctivo latino. 8vo. 48 pp. Ilfeld.

—— (Jul.) Geschichte der Methodik des lateinischen Elementarunterrichts seit der Reformation.

8vo. viii, 462 pp. Göttingen. Vandenhoeck & R. 8 Mk.

Lindskog (Cl.) Quaestiones de parataxi et hypotaxi apud priscos latinos. 8vo. iv, 95 pp. Lund. Möller. 1 Mk. 50.

Livius. Stacey (S. G.). Die Entwickelung des Livianischen Stiles. 8vo. 66 pp. München.

Locw (E.) Ueber die beiden bukolischen Gedichte des Codex Einsidlensis. 8vo. 34 pp. Wien.

Lucianus. Œuvres complètes. Traduction de Belin de Ballu, avec une introduction, des notes et un index par L. Humbert. Vol. I. 8vo. xx, 664 pp. Paris, Garnier.

Luckenbach (H.) Die Akropolis v. Athen. 4to. 38 pp., engravings. Karlsruhe.

—— (H.) Die Akropolis von Athen. 4to II, 39 pp. 30 Engravings. München. Oldenbourg. 1 Mk. 54.

Lucretii (Cari.) De rerum natura libri vi, testo commento e studi introduttivi di C Guissani. Vol II. (Libro I. II.) 8vo. xi, 227 pp. Torino. Loescher.

—— Hidén (C. J.) De casuum syntaxi Lucretiana. I. 8vo. xi, 122 pp. Helsingfors.

Marius Victor. Maurer (H.) De exemplis quae Claudius Marius Victor in Alethia secutus sit. 8vo. 127 pp. Marburg.

Meister. Rechtsvertrag zwischen Chaleion und Oianthea. 8vo. 25 pp. Leipzig.

Miscellanea Tironiana. Aus dem Codex Vaticanus Latinus Reginae Christianae 846 (Folio 90–114), herausgegeben von Wilh. Schmitz. Royal 4to. v, 79 pp. In Portfolio. Leipzig, Teubner. 20 Mk.

Niese (B.) Grundriss der römischen Geschichte nebst Quellenkunde. 2nd Ed. (Müller's Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, Vol. III., 5.) 8vo. viii, 265 pp. München, Beck. 5 Mk.

Ovidius. Koczynski (L.) De flexura Graecorum nominum propriorum apud Ovidium. 8vo. 25 pp. Radautz.

—— Schoener (C.) Ueber ein Gesetz der Wortstellung im Pentameter des Ovid und über die Bedeutung der Cäsur für den Satzton. 8vo. 31 pp. Erlangen.

Philo. Krell (E.) Philo, περὶ τοῦ πάντα σπουδαῖον εἶναι ἐλεύθερον, die Echtheitsfrage. 8vo. 38 pp. Augsburg.

Plato Andruzos (C.) Τὸ κακὸν παρὰ Πλατῶνι τμῆμα ἃ ἐννοῖα τοῦ κακοῦ 8vo. 53 pp. Leipzig.

—— Hartman (I. L. V.) notae criticae ad Platonis de republica libros. Pars I. (libri I—V.) 8vo. xii, 139 pp. The Hague, Nijhoff. 4 Mk. 25.

—— Horneffer (E.) De Hippia maiore qui fertur Platonis. 8vo. 78 pp. Göttingen.

—— Ritter (Const.) Platos Gesetze. Darstellung des Inhalts. 8vo. ix, 162 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk. 20.

—— Kommentar zum Griechischen Text, by the same. 8vo. ix, 415 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 10 Mk.

—— Schewczik (R.) Platos Lehre von der Seele nach den Quellen dargestellt und beurtheilt. (I. Theil). 8vo. 24 pp. Wiener-Neustadt.

Plautus. Pischl (W.) Die Menächmen des Plautus und ihre Bearbeitung durch Regnard. 8vo. 38 pp. Feldkirch.

Plinius. John. Die Briefe des jüngeren Plinius und der Dialogus. 4to. 11 pp. Schwäbisch Hall.

Plutarchus. Weissenberger (B.) Die Sprache Plutarchs von Chaeronea und die pseudoplutarchischen Schriften. II. 8vo. 59 pp. Straubing.

Pregél (F.) Die Technik im Alterthum. Eine kulturgeschichtliche Skizze. 4to. 54 pp. Chemnitz.

Propertius. Fleischmann (H.) Quaestiones Propertianae. II. 8vo. 34 pp. Bielitz.

Reber (F. v.) Ueber das Verhältnis des mykenischen zum dorischen Baustil. 4to. 55 pp., engravings, 2 plates. München.

Rehm (A.) Mythographische Sternsagen. 8vo. 48 pp. München.

Renel (C.) Compositorum graecorum quorum in ΣΙ prior pars exit de origine et usu. 8vo. 117 pp. Lyon.

Roschatt (A.) Die synonymen Verbindungen bei den attischen Rednern. 8vo. 42 pp. Freising.

Sallustius. Kunst (K.) Bedeutung und Gebrauch der zu der Wurzel fu gehörigen Verbalformen bei Sallust. 8vo. 34 pp. Wien.

Sauer (A.) Die Lyrik in Sparta und deren Hauptvertreter. 8vo. 88 pp. Wien.

Seneca. Lettres à Lucilius (I—XVI.) Édition classique avec un commentaire philosophique historique littéraire par R. Thamin. 8vo. 127 pp. Paris. Delagrave.

Sophocles. Aias, erläutert von Chr. Muff. Text. 12mo. xxiii, 84 pp. Bielefeld. 90 Pf.

—— the same. Kommentar. 12mo. 63 pp. Bielefeld. 70 Pf.

—— Electra, erklärt von G. Kaibel. (Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Commentare zu griechischen und römischen Schriftstellern. 8vo. viii, 310 pp. Cloth. Leipzig, Teubner. 7 Mk.

—— Pichler (Frz.) Beiträge zur Uberlieferung der Sophocles-Scholien. 8vo. 12 pp. Graz, Leuschner. 70 Pf.

Spiegel (N.) Untersuchungen über die ältere christliche Hymnenpoësie. I. Teil: Reimverwendung und Taktwechsel. 8vo. 64 pp. Würzburg.

Statius. Klotz (A.) Curae Statianae. 8vo. 80 pp. Leipzig.

Stein (F.) Die Völkerstämme der Germanen nach römischer Darstellung. Ein Commentar zu Plinius Natur. hist. IV., 28 u. Tacitus Germ. c. 2. 8vo. vii, 103 pp. Schweinfurt.

Streiter (R.) Karl Böttichers Tektonik der Hellenen. Als ästhetische und kunstgeschichtliche Theorie. Eine Kritik. I. 8vo. 55 pp. München.

Studien (Philologische). Festgabe für Eduard Sievers zum 1 Oct. 1896. 8vo. vi, 441 pp. Halle, Niemeyer. 12 Mk.

Sturm (A.) Das delische Problem. (Fortsetzung) 8vo. 43 pp., engravings. Seitenstetten.

Tacitus. Annalen I.—III. erläutert von R. Lange. Text. 8vo. xvi, 158 pp., map. Bielefeld. 1 Mk. 40.

Theimer (A.) Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Sprachgebrauches in Neuen Testamente. 8vo. 40 pp. Horn.

Thucydides in Auswahl, herausgegeben von E. Lange. Hilfsheft und Commentar. 8vo. viii, 54 and iv, 185 pp., engravings. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk.

Trommsdorff (P.) Questiones duae ad historiam legionum Romanorum spectantes. 8vo. 96 pp. Leipzig.

Vahlen (J.) Ueber Ennius und Lucretius. 8vo. 12 pp. Berlin.

Valerii Flacci Setini Balbi argonauticon libri octo, enarravit P. Langen. Parts I, II (libri I—VIII.) 8vo. 572 pp. Berlin. Calvary. 12 Mks.

Wachtler (Jo.) De Alcmaeone Crotoniata. 8vo. 104 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk. 20.

Walser (J.) Der Vers als Wortcomplex oder die

Verkörperung rythmischer Formen in der sprachlichen Darstellung. 8vo. 22 pp. Wien.

Weber (F. H.) Die genetische Entwickelung des Zahl- und Raumbegriffes in der griechischen Philosophie bis Aristoteles und der Begriff der Unendlichkeit. 8vo. 131 pp. Strassburg.

Weissmann (K.) Die scenischen Anweisungen in den Scholien zu Aischylos, Sophocles, Euripides und Aristophanes und ihre Bedeutung für die Bühnenkunde. 8vo. 54 pp. Bamberg.

Wulf (H.) De fabellis cum collegii septem sapientium memoria conjunctis quaestiones criticae. 8vo. 32 pp. Halle.

Xenophon. Anabase. Texte grec, avec une introduction et des notes par P. Couvreur. 12mo. lv, 591 pp. Paris. Hachette. 3 Fr.

—— Anabasis. Textausgabe für den Schulgebrauch von W. Gemoll. 8vo. xxxiv, 297 pp., plate, map. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 60.

—— Memorabilien. Textausgabe für den Schulgebrauch von W. Gilbert. 8vo. xv, 181 pp. Portrait. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 10.

—— Osberger (G.) Studien zum 1. Buch von Xenophons Anabasis. 8vo. 56 pp. Speier.

Ziehen (L.) Leges Graecorum sacrae e titulis collectae. I. 8vo. 25 pp. Bonn.

The Classical Review

MARCH 1897.

CONTESTED ETYMOLOGIES.

(*Continued from* p. 15.)

V.—ὄβριμος OR ὄμβριμος?

§ 1. The spelling ὄμβριμος occurs on a papyrus MS. of the third to fifth century for Iliad Γ 357 (Kenyon's *Classical Texts from Papyri in the Brit. Mus.* 81). MSS. of Pindar and Hesiod also contain it. The form Ὄβριμος is preserved on the inscriptions from Pergamon (i. no. 116). W. Schulze (*K.Z.* 33, 368-) regards the μ of this form as parasitic, noting λάμβδα || λάβδα beside Hebrew *lāmed*. He draws after a little argumentation the conclusion: 'erst aus λάβδα ist λάμβδα durch secundäre wucherung enstanden.' Into this conclusion I cannot follow him. It will sufficiently explain the phenomena to regard ὄμβριμος as the original form, with a loss of its first μ by dissimilation.

§ 2. For the solution of this question we must have recourse to etymology. Grassmann (*K.Z.* 12, 91) compared *ambhṛṇá-s*, defined by Böhtlingk 'furchtbar,' by the Nāighaṇṭakukāṇḍa 'gross,' and by Sāyana 'fürchterlich schreiend.' Schaper (*K.Z.* 22, 524) writes 'ὄ-βριμος (βρίμη) robur secum habens,' taking ὄ- as the 'copulative' in the sense of σύν. Curtius (*Grdze.*[5] 532) takes ὄ- as 'prothetic,' and connects with βρῑ-θω 'be heavy,' etc. There is, however, a difficulty about the quantity of the ι if βρίμης (Hymn. Hom. 28, 10) is a correct emendation, as Hesychius's βρίμη· ἀπειλὴ καὶ γυναικεία ἀῤῥητοποιία seems to declare. That ὄβρῐμος was however brought into connection with βρῑθο and its kin by the Greeks seems to be attested by the variant Ὀβριαρεύς for βριαρεύς (*Et. Mag.* 346, 41). Froehde (*B.B.* 8, 162) compared Sk. *ugrá* with ὄβριμος, by a phonetic process that is at least abnormal. Fick (*B.B.* 16, 170) equates ὄβριμος with Sk. *agrimá-s* 'voranstehend,' and this is accepted by Prellwitz (*Et. Wört.* s.v.). I, for one, cannot bring myself to accept an etymology that separates *agrimás* from √*aj*. 'drive.' Johannson (*I.F.* 3, 239) favours Curtius's explanation.

§ 3. Of all these comparisons that with ὄμβρος[1] 'rain-cloud' and its kin seems to me the best. We have in Homer the explicit phrase ὄβριμον ὕδωρ (Δ 453). Besides, Athena, daughter of Zeus the thunderer, is ὀβριμοπάτρη. The signification is also attested elsewhere, thus Sk. *ámbhas* 'water' beside *ambhṛ-ṇá* 'fearful, great.' The same meanings appear in Sk. *ugrá* 'mighty' = ὑγρός 'moist.'

§ 4. As to the form, ὑγρός 'moist' has in ὕβρι-ς 'violence' a parallel *i*-stem; so the Lat. correspondent of ὄμβρο-ς is *imbri-* (gen. plur. *imbri-um*); of such an *i*-stem ὄμβρι-μος is a derivative. Greek also has in ἄβρομος 'noisy' < *m̥bhr- (*Il.* N, 41) an *o*-stem in the weak grade as Lat. *imber* is an *i*-stem in this grade. The form ὄβριμος, if correct for Homer, may also be regarded as a compromise between ὄμβριμος and ἄβρομος.

[1] With β for normal φ because of the nasal: *supra*, III § 3.

VI.—ὅπατρος ETC. : 'COPULATIVE' ὁ-.

The 'copulative' ὁ- seems to occur with ὅ-τριχες 'like-haired,' ὅ-ζυγες 'of the same span.' Parallel with ὅζυγες is ὁμόζυγες, and with ὅπατρος ὁμοπάτριος with a mate in ὁμομήτριος. From this last we might have by haplolaly *ὁμήτριος whence *ὅπατορ; ὅτριχες would have normally lost its rough breathing, and ὅζυγες ὅπατρος [1] followed this lead. Such haplolaly is very common (cf. Wackernagel, *Altind. Gram.* § 241, and the literature there cited). I propose now to point out several cases not yet recognized in Greek.

VII.—SOME CASES OF HAPLOLALIA.

(1) ὅμηρος 'hostage.'

§ 1. The old division ὅμ-ηρος (Curtius *Grdze.*[5] p. 340) is still in vogue (Prellwitz, *Et. Wört.* s.v.). This derivation from ὁμ- and ἀραρίσκω can neither be proved nor disproved without the testimony of non-Ionic inscriptions. From ὁμαρὲς· ὁμοῦ συμφώνως (Hesychius) ᾱ is not proved. I suggest therefore that we explain from *ὁμο-μηρος, connecting with μέρος 'part.' Treaties between equals had hostages on both sides (cf. Caesar, *B. G.* i. 9). Two bands of hostages would be guaranteed to have *equal-treatment*, or to be of *equal-rank*, or of *equal-number*, cf. μέρος 'destiny, rank, part.' We have here, it seems to me a *bahuvrīhi* compound, as the accent shows, cf. ὅμορος 'having the same boundary.' For the division ὅμ-ηρος it is not easy to justify the accent, as in that case we cannot operate with a *bahuvrīhi* compound, and the primary meaning ought to be something like 'compact.'

(2) ὅμαδος 'din, noisy-company.'

§ 2. Düntzer (*K.Z.* 15, 361) objected on the score of the accent to a derivation from ὁμός 'together': I note *e.g.* ὁμαλός. He also criticises Curtius for the derivation from ὁμο + ϝαδ: Sk. √*vad*-speak, and the last edition of the *Grundzüge* passes it over in silence, save calling it obscure and dividing ὅμα-δος (p. 629). Düntzer also denies the likelihood of our having a compound here like ὅμαιμος, and suggests that the word is onomatopoetic. Prellwitz (*Et. Wört.* s.v.) compares M.H.G. *summen*, a comparison which is only valid if ὅμαδος be onomatopoetic, but makes an alternative reference to ὅμος, noting ὁμοκλή, where of course -κλή belongs to καλέω 'call.' I believe myself that the original word was *ὁμόμαδος, and meant 'having a drinking-bout together.' The word is used in the *Iliad* of a tumultuous assemblage, while in the *Odyssey* the verb ὁμάδησαν is used always of the suitors and means 'cheer.' The whole circle of ideas is pretty well represented in our word *cheer*. I also note German *rauschen*. As to the form, -μαδος is in Sk. *máda* 'jollity, drunkenness.' We find in Hesychius μαδᾶ· ἐκρεῖ followed alphabetically by μαγδαλλεῖ· τίλλει, ἐσθίει—μαγδάλλοντες· τίλλοντες, ἐσθίοντες—μαδάρος, etc. Salmasius corrected to μαδαλλεῖ, etc. Now μαδᾶ 'is wet' and μαδαλλεῖ 'eats' vindicate for Greek a root μαδ- 'be drunken, jolly,' Homer uses ὅμαδος and δοῦπος side by side, *e.g.* I. 573; κ 556: perhaps the spelling γδοῦπος beside δοῦπος caused -μαγδος beside -μαδος.

§ 3. In the light of this suggestion we are able to interpret ὀρυμαγδός 'din', used by Homer of the confused noises of men in arms, or even of horses and dogs. I would divide the word ὀρυ-μαγδός, and regard -μαγδός as a byform of -μαδος in ὅ-μαδος. We have in Hesychius ὀρυγμάδες and ὀρυγμαδός of the same meaning as ὀρυμαγδός, and possibly the original word was ὀρυγμαδός with a 'skipping' in Homer of the γ. For ὀρυγ- we can cite ὀρυγάνει· ἐρεύγεται 'bellow, roar'; in these words there is doubtless original kinship. As I do not myself believe in a two-syllabled gradation, I would not explain ὁ- of ὀρυγάνω as due to gradation, but as an assimilation from *ἐρύγνω (cf. Joh. Schmidt *K.Z.* 32, 344). The ἐ- of these words I take to be of the same nature as in ἐθέλω, that is a fossilized augment ε-. The stem ὀρυγ- is also attested by ὄρυγμος· βρυχόμενος 'eating noisily.' On the other hand we can cite for ορυ- ὀρύεται [2] ὑλακτεῖ 'roars' (Hesychius).

§ 4. If we take ὀρυγμαδός to have been the etymological form of the word, and ὀρυμαγδός an abnormal form, then we can explain in still a different way the origin of the Hesychian forms μαγδάλλει etc. cited above, viz. as influenced by ὀρυμαγδός. Either explanation makes a word entity of -μαδος in ὅμαδος and -μαγδός in ὀρυμαγδός, and so furthers my assumption that ὅμαδος is for *ὁμό-μαδος.[3]

[1] Or perhaps ὅπατρος lost its rough breathing along with its synonym ἀδελφός, where the aspirate of the following syllable played a rôle.

[2] This I take to be an unaugmented form belonging with ὠρύετο 'howled,' whence the augmented long has been adopted for the present ὠρύομαι instead of ὀρύομαι. Of course one can operate with the 'dehnstufe' if one chooses, and likes mysteries. It sometimes seems to me more probable that the ὠ- of this verb is the interjection ō!

[3] We may indeed charge upon this word the suffixal -αδος of χρόμ-αδος, κέλ-αδος 'noise, din'; perhaps too κορυδός (Hesych. κόρυθος) 'tufted lark' has been affected; ἀρκί-δ 'locust' and πελει-άδ 'wild dove'; μαι-ναδ- 'raving,' μηκάδ- 'bleating,' αἰγίδ-

On the same general lines Sk. *samád-* 'quarrel, battle' is to be referred to *sṃ-* + √*mad*.

(3) ἄμιλλα 'prize contest,' ὅμῑλος 'assembly.—'? Lat. *mīlia* 'thousands.'

§ 5. Latin *simultas* seems to help the derivation of ὅμ-αδος and *sam-ád-* from *sam-*, only simultas may well be a compound *simul-i-tas* 'going together,' just as *simulter* is used in Plautus for similiter; or *simultas* is an *in malum sensum* byform of *similitas*.

§ 6. Misteli (*K.Z.* 17, 177) derives ἄμιλλα from **ám-īl-yā* that is ἅμα + ῑ̓λ whence ἴλη 'troop' and compares ὁμῑλία, deriving the signification of both from the sense of 'crowding together.'[1] Prellwitz (*Et. Wört.* s.v.) derives ἄμιλλα from *sem-ilia*, and compares Lat. *similis* 'like': *simultas* 'enmity.' Lat. *-ilis*, however, should be in Greek *-αλος*, if we may judge by χθαμαλός: *humilis*, ὁμαλός: *similis*.

§ 7. I believe, with Misteli (*l.c.*), that ἄμιλλα and ὅμῑλος are akin, and suggest their derivation from **ámα-μισ-λο-* and **ὁμο-μισλο-* respectively. For σλ>λλ compare χέλλιοι and χίλιοι 'thousand': Sk. (*sa-*) *hásra-m.* I refer *-μισ-* to Sk. √*miṣ* which the *Dhātupāṭha* defines by *spardhāyām* 'contends for a prize.' This meaning has not been verified in the literature. We need not for that reason incontinently reject it. It is but a few years since Schroeder verified √*stigh* 'mount' in the *Māitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā*, though the correctness of the *Dhātupāṭha* was all along confirmed by στείχω and Germ. *steigen*. A Greek cognate is *μισ-θός* 'prize-money': Sk. *mūḍhá* 'prize, pay, prize-contest.' In Latin I derive *mīles* 'soldier' from **mis-l-*. Its inflexion is based on *comes, eques*, etc. In Greek ὅ-μῑλος means 'troop of soldiers.' I note M 3 οἳ δε μάχοντο | Ἀργέιοι καὶ Τρῶες ὁμιλαδόν[2] 'they fought, Greeks and Trojans, squadron-wise.'

§ 8. An interesting question arises as to the primary meaning of Sk. √*miṣ*. It means in the *Veda*, in combination with prepositions, 'wink the eyes.' In Brāhmaṇa √*mīl* occurs in the same sense. I take *mīl-* to be an extension of *miṣ-* (<*miṣl-*, cf. v. Bradke *K.Z.* 28, 298 and Johannson *I.F.* 2, 49), but, as many persons shut their eyes in smiling, it may be that *mīl-* is for *smīl-*: Eng. *smile*. Besides the meaning 'contend for a prize' the *Dhātupāṭha* defines √*miṣ* by 'besprengen' (cf. Kern, *I.F.* 4, 112). In Greek μιαίνω 'pollute, besmear' we probably have the same root; μίνθος 'dung' may be for **μίννθος* <*μισ-ν-θος* (cf. ἔννυμι <**Fεσ-νυμι*), but μίνθος may be from √*mingh-*, with a 'velar' alongside of the palatal form *miǵh-* (cf. Sk. *megh-á-s* 'cloud'); perhaps also in μίσ-γω there is a contamination of μισ- and μιγ-. A root *mĭs* seems abundantly warranted also for Dutch dialects (cf. Kern, *l.c.*). In classical Sanskrit appears √*mil* 'combine,' Taking Sanskrit alone, all these meanings can be derived from the sense 'put-together, mix.' It is a simple assumption that *mel-ayati* 'he puts together' is in point of formation a causative from √*mīl* (cf. *heḍayati* from √*hīḍ*), specialized in meaning and subsequently begetting √*mĭl* 'combine' which is not found till after the Epic and Kalidasa, and is said also to be lacking in the *Dhātupāṭha* (cf. Böhtlingk, *s.v.*).

§ 9. For *mīlia* 'thousands' a connection is still made with ὅμῑλος and Sk. √*mīl* and its kin (cf. Johannson *I.F.* 2, 34). Prellwitz connects with μάλα 'very' (*Et. Wört.*, s.v.). Still another theory connects with μύριοι (L. Havet, *Mém. Soc. Ling.* 3, 415, Thurneysen, *K.Z.* 30, 353). There is objection to the phonetics of the third explanation; the second is possible, but scarcely probable, and the drift of meaning is but vague. As to the first any comparison with the late Sanskrit root *mĭl* is out of the question, for √*mĭl* is doubtless a special formation (cf. supra, and Böhtlingk u. Roth, *s.v.*). Stokes cites (Fick's *Wört.*[4] ii. s.v. *mêlo*) Buddhistic *mela* 'an indefinite number,' the authority for which is Vyutpatti's *Sanskrit-Thibetan Lexicon*. Inasmuch as *vela* occurs on the same page, with the same definition, and *m* and *v* constantly interchange in Sanskrit manuscripts who shall say which of these forms is genuine? It were very venturesome to suggest that this special Buddhistic sense of a late Sanskrit word has any place in the inherited stock of the language. I have just pleaded for an Aryan root *mis-* 'put together,' and *mīlia* could be referred to that for its signification in a vague sort of way. But in ὅ-μῑλος it is from the ὅ- that we must derive the notion of 'troop.' Thus neither in Greek

'storm-cloud,' ἔριδ- 'strife' show in what various ways this suffix could have extended itself.

[1] To the same group also he joins ἄμαλλα 'sheaf of corn, corn' (*K.Z.* 19, 119), but the smooth breathing and the vocalism contradict this. I would divide ἄ-μαλλα and refer to ἀλέω 'grind' < *ϝμλέω, Lat. *molo*. For the signification note Lat. *grānum* 'corn': Sk. *jīr-ṇá* 'ground.'

[2] After Homer ἴλαδόν takes the place of ὁμιλαδόν. Perhaps we have here a false division; ὁμ-ενυέτης: εὐνέτης=ὁμ-εστιος: ἑστια=ὁμ-ιλαδόν: ἰλαδόν. For further examples of such divisions see below § 14. This explanation would relieve the difficulty of the vocalisation in connecting ἴλη 'squadron' with εἴλλω (Aeolic ἔλλειν, Doric *Fηλέω*) <**Fελγω*.

nor Sanskrit does any early cognate of √*miṣ* imply a number. Therefore the first explantion seems to me untenable.

§ 10. There is a fourth explanation proposed by myself (*Am. Jr. Phil.* 13, 226), that derives *mīlia*[1] from *sm*+*hilia* 'one thousand': χέλλιοι, χίλιοι 'thousand' and Sk. *sahasram* 'one thousand.' This explanation has been accepted by Clark (*Manual of Linguistics*, *v.* index) and Bennett (Appendix to his *Latin Grammar*, § 183, 16) regards it the most probable. Giles (*Manual of Comp. Philology* § 425) calls my explanation 'ingenious but not very plausible.' Lindsay (*Latin Language*, p. 420) thinks it worth reporting [in brackets], but does not accept it. His own suggestion is to set up for Celtic and Latin a separate word for thousand. But every one admits that OIr. *míle*[2] may be a loanword from the Latin (cf. *e.g.* Brugmann *Gr.* ii. § 181, and Stokes *l.c.*). No one, I take it, can deny the plausibility of equating **(h)īlia* with χῑλιοι, save in gender. Because of *semel* (which may as well be for Aryan *sem-* as for *sm̥m-*), one may say that the Latin form should be **semīlia*. The question is not, I am aware, one of Aryan phonetics, or a citation of Sk. *sm-ád* 'unā' would suffice to settle it. The question rather is whether Aryan **sem *ghés-ro-* 'one thousand' may not have become in Italic **sm(h)ilia* as well as in Indiranic it became **sm̥hásra-m* 'thousand.' To answer this question conclusively in the negative is at least as hard as to do so in the affirmative. If, as is claimed, Lucilius does not write original ī as *ei*,[3] still his *meilia*, so far from invalidating my explanation from **hezlia*> **hēlia*, and, by assimilation, **hīlia* (cf. *fīlius* for *fēlius*) does make against the comparison with ὅ-μῑλος where the ī is original. My explanation certainly has the advantage of every other so far as signification is concerned, and cannot be refused on the score of any express law of phonetics.

(4) *aquila* 'eagle,' *aquilo* 'north-wind.'

§ 11. Pauli (*K.Z.* 18, 28) connects *aquila* with *aqui-penser* (for *acipenser*) 'sturgeon,' and with *acus* sharp. Fick (*ib.* 19, 257) defines *aquilo* as 'der dunkles wetter bringende.' He compares O. Pruss. *aglo* 'rain' and Lith. *ãklas* 'blind.' He further compares ἄκαρον· τυφλόν (Hesych.), and ἀχλύς 'cloud, darkness'; *aquila* is the black-eagle, μελανάετος. Fick's explanation still obtains, and is strong in point of the signification, chiefly because of the adjective *aquilus* 'dusky.' From the point of view of Latin alone all these words may be haplolalic, *aquila* <**áquiquela* 'dwelling in the clouds,' cf. *inquilinus* (<**enquelinos*, v. Lindsay, *l.c.* p. 229), *īn-cola* 'inhabitant': note also ἐν νεφέλαισιν ἀετός (Ar. *Eq.* 1013), and the epithet ὑψιπετής 'high-flying'; *aquilo* < **áquiquelon-* 'cloud-driving,' cf. αἰ-πόλος 'goat herd,' Lat. *ū-pilio* 'shep-herd'; whereas *aquilus* 'water-bringing' may have been an epithet of the dark cloud. If Fick's comparison with O. Pruss. *aglo* and Lith. *ãklas* were correct we should probably expect in Latin *aculus*, cf. *torculus : torqueo*, and *coculus : coquo*. In regard to the definition of *aqua* by 'cloud' I note *imber* 'rain-cloud, rain.' The *rôle* of the eagle as *armiger Iovis* makes for the connection with the storm.

§ 12. For the signification I note the words αἰετός 'eagle' and Αἴολος 'god of the winds' which are also probably cognate with each other, cf. ἀΰηρ 'air,' ἀήτης 'wind,' ἄελλα 'storm': ἄημι 'blow.' Hesychius gives us αἰβετός, cf. Doric ἄβηρ. A reason for αἰ- and not α- is to be sought. There may have been association with αἰθήρ and its kin (cf. τ 540; ὅ δ' [αἰετός] ἐς αἰθέρα δῖαν ἀέρθη, and Ο 690 αἰετὸς αἴθων 'the gleaming eagle'), or the Homeric doublet αἰεί || ἀεί 'always' had influence, for the old age of the eagle seems to have been proverbial (cf. Terence, *Heauton*, 521, where the proverb probably proceeds from a Greek source). In Hesychius we have the two glosses ἀήτης· ἄνεμος, and αἰῆται· ἄνεμοι.

(5) ὁμῆλιξ 'contemporary.'

§ 13. The current division is ὁμ-ῆλιξ. Savelsberg (*K Z.* 8, 406) brings forward ὁμο-ῆλιξ from the appendix of the anthology and cites βαλικιώτης· συνέφηβος, Κρῆτες (Hesychius). He derives from a 'relative' stem **ϝο-*. Prellwitz (*Et. Wört.* s.v.) refers ἥλιξ, Doric ἅλιξ to the relative stem *yā-*. We are not told why the feminine stem is used, however, in forming the word. I am not able to find that the relative ἡλίκος 'as big as, as old as' is ever ἀλίκος.

§ 14. It is to be noted that ἥλιξ and ὁμῆλιξ both mean 'of the same age, contemporary,' and they do not seem to show a trace of a

[1] I note here from Thurneysen (*K.Z.* 30, 353): (Für milia) 'aber auch Lucilius (ed. L. Müller ix. 21) die schreibung mit *ei* verlangt, der offenes und geschlossenes ī sonst noch richtig scheidet.' Lucilius's simple and childlike rule, however, seems to have been to use ī for singulars and *ei* for plurals (cf. Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.* p. 9)!

[2] According to Stokes, *BB.* 11, 171, the Celtic inflection shows a fem. *ia* stem. In Latin the neuter prevailed while χίλιοι is of all genders. In Latin *mille* is a singular to *milia*, based on *omne, omnia*: thus the original *io*-stem became an *i*-stem.

[3] See the last foot-note but one on the worth of Lucilius's distinction!

relative use; besides their noun value is rather harsh if they come from the relative. I propose to divide ὁ-μῆλιξ for *ὁμό-μηλιξ 'having the same age.' I connect *-μηλιξ with Goth. *mel* 'time,' and possibly with Greek μέλλαξ, young man (Hesych. μέλακες). There is difficulty about the vowel however. Theocritus uses ὁμᾶλιξ, and we might then connect with μάλεοι· ὅριοι 'boundaries' (Hesych.), and define 'having the same boundaries.' Homer uses the word pre-eminently of young persons, and it is possible that we should connect with μαλακός 'soft' (cf. Aristoph. *Plut.* 1022: μαλακὸν βλέμμα 'youthful looks'). In that case we should compare O. Pruss. *mal-nīks* 'youth' beside *maldai* 'young,' noting the Greek doublet μαλ-ακός || μαλθ-ακός 'young.' I would explain therefore *ὁμομήλικες (nom. plur.) as *ὁμομᾰλικες with lengthening of the antepenult as in ἀνωνυμος (*supra*, iv. § 2), by de Saussure's 'loi rythmique.'[1] When ὁμᾶλιξ was arrived at by haplolaly then a false division was made ὁμ-ᾶλιξ, and -αλιξ abstracted as an independent word in the same sense as ὅμαλιξ. This -αλιξ fell in the Ionic dialects under association with ἡλίκος 'as great as,' and took on a rough breathing. False divisions of words in English have been very common, thus *a nadder* has become *an adder* (for numerous examples cf. C. P. G. Scott, *Transac. Am. Phil. Assoc.* 23, 179–; 24, 89–).[2] Note also above (§ 8) ἰλαδὸν by false division of ὁμιλαδὸν. Hopkins (*Proc. Am. Or. Soc.* 1892, p. clxxvi.) shows that Sk. *áhan* day is almost universally preceded by words with final *-d*, so that it is an easy assumption that *yád áhar* comes from *yád *dáhar*.

[1] Brugmann (*K.Z.* 27, 590) upholds his previous theory (*M.U.* 3, 78—) that σοφώ-τερος is formed analogically from adverb forms like ἀνω-τέρω, say, and denies that a vowel is ever lengthened under this condition. I note the following pairs: ἐλατός, 'ductile,' but ἀν-ήλατος, 'not ductile'; ἄνεμος wind: ἀν-ήνεμος; ἄροτος 'tillage': ἀν-ήροτος; ὀδύνη 'pain': ἀν-ώδυνος; ὁμαλός 'even': ἀν-ώμαλος etc. From these examples lengthening in composition spread beyond the limits demanded by the rythmic law, *e.g.* ἀν-ώλεθρος: ὄλεθρος, destruction (Homeric ἀνόλεθρος). I see no good ground for an analogy from ἀνωτέρω to σοφώτερος. Why do we not have *πρωτερω and *πρωτερος? Brugmann's claim is psychologically erroneous when he says that σοφώ-τερος, an original adverbial form, was maintained but not created by the 'loi rythmique.' The Greek who always used μακρότερος (– ⏑ ⏑ ⏑) but σοφώτερος (⏑ – ⏑ ⏑) was in fact avoiding four successive shorts, and he could not have done so long without evolving the belief that ω in σοφώτηρος was the ŏ of σοφός lengthened for a rythmical purpose.

[2] An interesting example is that of a little boy I knew who said *a gin* (for *again*), and extended that by saying *another gin*.

(5) The tens in composition.

§ 15. Everybody is agreed that the Aryan word for hundred **kṃtó-* is clipt from **dekṃtó-*. Bugge's explanation (*B.B.* 14, 72) assumes an intermediate form **dkṃtó-*, and amounts to saying that two syllables have been weakened by the one accent of *-tó*. For my own part, this seems utterly unlikely. We may in several ways account for the loss of *de-*.

§ 16. Inasmuch as the stem *-kṃtó* is used in composition to form the tens, *e.g.* τριάκοντα 'thirty,' it is possible that there was progressive working of the accent (Kretschmer, *K.Z.* 31, 325), *i.e.* τριάκοντα <*τρια-δκοντα, whence *τριᾰκκοντα, if I may use Greek as typical for the Aryan process. This is perhaps the theory of Lindsay (*Lat. Lang.* p. 417) who explains **(d)kṃt* as 'changed in composition.' The same result may be reached in several ways by haplolaly. Thus, starting from the Gothic doublet *taihuntēhund*||*taihuntaihund* 'hundred,' there are two current explanations. One (cf. Brugmann, *Gr.* ii. § 179, and V. Henry, *Gr. Com. de l'Angl.* § 122) divides *taihuntē-hund* 'δεκάδων δεκάς' 'of tens a ten.' If this was, as Brugmann thinks, the oldest method of counting a hundred, then Aryan **dekṃdōn dekṃd* may have been shortened to something like **dekṃdǫkmd*. The second theory (cf. Kretschmer, *K.Z.* 31, 456) seems to me however more plausible. This divides *taihun-tēhund*, 'ten tens,' and regards *-tē-* as a lengthened *taí*, cf. O.Norse *-tān* '-teen' (<*-*tāhan*), and Runic *-tauntí* (<*-*tāhun*).

§ 17. I propose again to start from a theoretical *twenty*, **dvī dekṃtĭ* 'two tens' or **dvīs dekṃti* 'twice tens'[3] (cf. δισχίλιοι 'two thousand'). Assimilation of syllables is an especial feature of the numerals, *e.g.* Sk. *ṣaṣ*, Lith. *szesz-ì* 'six' (<*svekš*, cf. Pedersen, *I.F.* 5, 86); Lat. *quinque*, O.Ir. *cóic*, Germ. *fünf* 'five.' In like manner from **dvisdekmti* we may have had a succession of forms *dvez-dve°* > *dvezve°* > *vezve-*, and, by haplolaly, *vē°* (*ē°* being meant for *ĕ* with compensative lengthening). It is evident we might also start with **dvizdvi-*, and reach *vī-*. The assimilative processes assumed are unprovable as being located in the primitive period. They do not seem to me more unsubstantial than the arguments on which an Aryan **μει̯*[4] 'two' (inferred from Sk. *vi-ṣu* 'nach beiden seiten,' *vítaram* 'weiter,' *u-bhāu* 'both,' *dvā-ú* 'two,' Brugmann, *Gr.* ii. § 177) is

[3] Ahrens (*K.Z.* 8, 349) writes **δϜιδκατι* as the base of *Ϝικατι*.

[4] Johannson (*B.B.* 14, 171) goes even further an assumes *cvi* from ἐείκοσι, as to which v. infra § 5

based. The earlier linguisticians regarded *vĭ-* in the words for twenty as a byform of *dvĭ-* (cf. Sonne *K.Z.* 12, 341); so Sk. *viṣu* was for **dvi-ṣu*, and Sk. *vi*, Lat. *di* 'apart' were various treatments of **dvi-*. Grassmann (*ib.* 23, 576) thinks that O.E. *vidh* 'with' and Goth. *vithra* 'wieder' disprove this theory. As to the meaning Lat. *cum* and *contra* show precisely the same shift. The Germanic forms prove nothing more than that *v-* alternated with *dv-* in the primitive period. Such an alternation seems also proved by Latin *vi-tricus* 'step-father,' according to Brugmann (*Gr.* ii. § 75) a derivative of the compv. **vi-tr-*, but possibly for **vi-ptr-icus* 'the second father.' As to the Latin *di-* for *dvi-* it represents Aryan *di-*; note the doublets Sk. *tvé‖te*, *σοι‖τοι* (cf. Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.* p. 267). In general it may be remarked that initial *d-* seems to have been lost even before vowels, as in Germ. *tag:* Sk. *áh-an* 'day' (cf. Noreen, *l.c.* § 57, 3).[1] On the general subject of the treatment of initial *dv-* I refer to Pott, *K.Z.* 26, 152. The whole question in debate resolves to this: a stem *dvi-* 'two' is writ large in all the Aryan languages, and beside it is a sparse representation of *vi-* 'two,' mainly in isolated connections. To maintain that these stems are not to be regarded as cognate byforms is to forbid a man to make any mental projections whatever.[2]

EDWIN W. FAY.

[1] This loss of *d-* was probably due to sentence euphony, cf. Hopkins as cited above § 14.

[2] Fick (*Wört*[4], I. s. v. 3 *vā*, and s. v. *viṣu*) does recognize the forms in *dv-* as byforms.

(*To be continued.*)

AGAMEMNONEA.

123. *βλαβέντα λοισθίων δρόμων.*

Strange that Xenophon *Cyneg.* v. 14 has not been used to explain this much vexed line. Speaking of hares, he there says: *οἱ δὲ ἤδη ἔτειοι τάχιστα θέουσι τὸν πρῶτον δρόμον, τοὺς δ' ἄλλους οὐκέτι.* So *δρόμοι* in the plural means one 'run' of a hare divided into several 'spurts.' The *πρῶτος δρόμος* is the first 'spurt,' after which the hare stops, and then goes on again. *προλαμβάνοντες δὲ τὰς κύνας ἐφίστανται . . . καὶ ὅθεν ἂν ἀκούσωσιν ἀποτρέπονται* (*Cyn.* v. 19).[1] A hare will, I suppose, do this several times in the course of a run.[2] And in v. 17 Xenophon uses a plural like that of Aeschylus: *οἱ δ' ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς τόπους πλανῆται χαλεποὶ πρὸς τοὺς δρόμους*, cp. vi. 19. Thus *βλαβέντα λοισθίων δρόμων* signifies *caught in the last spurt* or else *stopped from the remaining spurts.*

The same sentence of Xenophon is otherwise interesting in connexion with Aeschylus. *τὰ μὲν οὖν λίαν νεογνὰ οἱ φιλοκυνηγέται ἀφιᾶσι τῇ θεῷ* (Artemis of course). The young of hares were thus especially sacred to Artemis and this gives stronger meaning to the omen of the eagles, *αὐτότοκον πρὸ λόχου μογέραν πτάκα θυομένοισιν· στυγεῖ δὲ δεῖπνον αἰετῶν.*

'The difficulty is,' says Mr. Sidgwick presently, 'why should Artemis *ask* for the accomplishment of the cruelty which she hates?' What Artemis hates is the slaying of the young hares; that is done already by the eagles and she does not ask for any more of it. But *because* she hates it, the sign of the eagles is interpreted to signify her anger towards the Atridae. She does not hate the cruelty of killing Iphigenia; whether she ought or not, whatever puzzle it may have been to the devout Aeschylus, she does not. Quite the contrary. The omen means two things and only two. First that Troy will fall after a long siege, the hare and her young somehow meaning apparently the ten years exactly as the omen in the second book of the *Iliad*—the sparrow and her young—means them. Secondly that Artemis is angry with the Atridae. *Why* Aeschylus does not say, but Sophocles will tell us if we want to know.

Thus the eagles and hares are an improvement on the serpent and birds of the *Iliad*, because they have the same meaning and another besides, whether Aeschylus invented it or, as is more probable, some other poet between him and Homer.

However *τούτων αἰτεῖ ξύμβολα κρᾶναι*; this means, I take it, that she demands fulfilment of what tallies (Verrall) with the sign. And the sign means that Troy will fall at last, *οἷον μή τις ἄγα*, etc., 'only I am afraid of the anger of Artemis.' What tallies with this *sign* is the *fact* that if you want Troy to fall you must first appease the

[1] Cp. *Venus and Adonis* 697.

[2] In ix. 10 Xenophon speaks of the *τρίτος δρόμος* of a deer.

anger of the goddess. How Calchas knew the method of appeasing her does not appear and does not matter; there is nothing about it in the death of the hare and her young.

But here we come upon another difficulty which sorely puzzles the religious poet, as he shows by his digression, 170–193. Why is Agamemnon driven to commit his fearful crime by the gods who will hereafter take vengeance upon him for it? To justify the ways of half-civilized gods to man is no business of mine, but it is worth while to observe that all this strange theology comes straight out of Homer. Odysseus is twice warned most strictly not to touch the kine of the sun, nor to let his crew do so for they will all perish if they do. Yet they are compelled to do so by exactly the same cause as drove Agamemnon to sacrifice his daughter. And it was Zeus himself who set the wind against them and then jumped at the excuse for destroying them. The terrible simplicity with which it is all told by Homer is more impressive than the dark meditations of Aeschylus by almost as much as the starless night of *King Lear* is more awful than the lucid explanations of Milton. However I can have no doubt that the legend was developed by some poet later than Homer with the Odyssean system of divine Machiavellism in his mind, and that Aeschylus finding it an article of faith explained it as best he could by appealing to faith.

This is closely connected with the jealousy of the gods which is so unpleasant a feature of Greek belief. And it is in the *Odyssey* again that the gods first appear in this aspect, (δ 181, ε 119, ψ 211 and I daresay elsewhere). Infinite as is the advance shown by the *Odyssey* upon the *Iliad* in the presentation of the gods as a rule, this stain upon them is here found first; I can only hope that it was not the fault of the divinest of poets and of men.

131. *χρόνῳ μὲν ἀγρεῖ Πριάμου πόλιν ἅδε κέλευθος,*
πάντα δὲ πύργων
κτήνη πρόσθε τὰ δημιοπληθῆ
Μοῖρ' ἀλαπάξει πρὸς τὸ βίαιον·
οἷον μή τις ἄγα . . . . .

Comparing 1167, *ἰὼ πρόπυργοι θυσίαι πατρὸς πολυκανεῖς βοτῶν*, where Cassandra laments the inutility of her father's sacrifices to save Troy, I incline to think *πύργων πρόσθε* right in spite of the arguments brought against it. In any case *μὲν* corresponds to *οἷον*, not to *δέ*, and I take the meaning to be: 'though you will take Troy, and though Destiny will violently destroy all the sacrifices of the cattle of the people to defend their walls, yet I fear the wrath of Artemis.' But it were vain to deny that 'Destiny violently destroying the cattle' is a very odd way of describing their useless slaughter in propitiation of the gods. *ἀλαπάζω* is used simply for 'killing' in Orph. *Lith.* 599.

146. *τόσον περ εὔφρων καλά.*

The difficulties of this passage are notorious and the corrections innumerable. To me it seems incredible that *καλὰ* should stand as the subject for *ἁ καλὰ* (the reading, perhaps the conjecture, of an inferior MS.), and still more so that it should be the vocative. Emended it must be somehow. Suppose Aeschylus said *κἀκαλά*? The word *ἀκαλός*, connected with *ἧκα*, meant 'peaceful, still' according to the lexicographers; it might well mean 'gentle' with a dative. Corruption to *καλὰ* would be simply inevitable, and *ἁ καλὰ* may possibly also contain a further genuine relic of the original. Moreover I suspect *τερπνὰ* in 149 of being a gloss on *ἀκαλά* for I do not think that *θηρῶν ὀβρικάλοισι τερπνά* is a tolerable piece of versification amid its surroundings.

We have *ἀκαλὸς* in connection with Artemis elsewhere, though very likely by pure accident. Hesiod frag. 242 (Rzach): *Ὡς ἀκαλὰ προρέων ὡς ἁβρὴ παρθένος εἶσιν.* The line is quoted by Steph. Byz. s.v. *Παρθένιος* with the explanation *ἐκλήθη ἐκ τοῦ συνεχῶς περὶ αὐτὸν τὴν παρθένον Ἄρτεμιν κυνηγετεῖν ἢ διὰ τὸ ἠρεμαῖον καὶ παρθενῶδες τοῦ ῥεύματος.*

192. *δαιμόνων δέ που χάρις βιαίως*
σέλμα σεμνὸν ἡμένων.

I can have no doubt that Mr. Macnaghten's *δι' αἰῶς* is right with one slight change. The existence of *αἰῶ* is no more proof of the existence of *αἰῶς* than *Ἀπόλλω* is of *Ἀπόλλως*. And the next word begins with *σ*. Read then *δι' αἰῶ*.

880. *ἐν ὀψικοίτοις δ' ὄμμασιν βλάβας ἔχω.*

I am astonished not to find *βλάβας* challenged. If ever there was an inappropriate word, it is this. We could not say 'I have hurts or harms in my eyes,' and yet what else can *βλάβας* mean? Nor do I wish to follow Dr. Verrall in reading *κλάβας* with the best MS. here available. What Aeschylus must have written under the circum-

stances, if he used the *mot propre* at all, would be γλάμας or some word like it—I take γλάμας as the nearest word of the kind to the readings of the MSS. It would by a common corruption become γλάβας, from whence *might* come both our readings. Compare Plautus *Curc.* 317 : *os amarum* MSS., *gramarum* Bücheler.

1180. ὥστε κύματος δίκην
κλύζειν πρὸς αὐγὰς τοῦδε πήματος πολὺ
μεῖζον.

κλύειν MSS., κλύζειν Auratus, an unsatisfactory change generally accepted. κλύζειν πῆμα might mean 'to wash away an evil,' but could not mean 'to roll it onward.' ἴλλειν is all but as near the MSS. after all, and is the word we want.

1321. ἄπαξ ἔτ' εἰπεῖν ῥῆσιν ἢ θρῆνον θέλω
ἐμὸν τὸν αὐτῆς.

Professor Housman's ἠριθνὴς for ῥῆσιν ἢ is one of the most ingenious proposals in his brilliant paper on *Agamemnon* (*Journal of Philology*, No. 32). But yet it will not do. The word itself is no doubt a good word enough, but not only does it somehow not suit the context to my mind, it brings out into stronger relief the prosy εἰπεῖν which precedes it. 'To speak a speech or a dirge' is conceivable English; 'to speak a dirge' is not. And so εἰπεῖν ῥῆσιν ἢ θρῆνον is conceivable Greek though the most deplorable poetry, but εἰπεῖν θρῆνον—no. Suppose then ἠριθνὴς the original, and we must also suppose εἰπεῖν a second corruption later than ῥῆσιν, and caused by it. If, for instance, an editor found ὑμνεῖν ῥῆσιν ἢ θρῆνον, he might well change ὑμνεῖν to εἰπεῖν.

But what is more probable is that the whole phrase is simply a very bad stop-gap due to some one who found a lacuna in the line. There must be many such conjectural supplements in our Aeschylus. To give only a few examples of lacunae, it is notorious that they still remain at the ends of *Ag.* 1664, 1672, 1673; a bad supplement is to be found in 1025 δουλίας μάζης βία (where I should prefer φαγεῖν to any correction I have seen); later on we will discuss 1594-5. And I have no doubt whatever that at least two lines have gone between *Eum.* 431 and 432. When a whole line or several lines are lost, as in the last two cases, the ancient editor or copyist would probably leave well alone, but when he found a line defective in itself he would certainly fill it up as a rule, and I tremble to think how many atrocities may be defended by some and ingeniously emended by others in Aeschylus which are due to no other cause than this.

To return to *Ag.* 1321. It would be easy to fill up the gap with better conjectures than the old editor's, such as ἄπαξ ἔθ' ὑμνεῖν ὕστατον θρῆνον θέλω, but of course there is no hope of hitting on the truth. Considering the words ἐμὸν τὸν αὐτῆς, and comparing *Cho.* 925 : ἔοικα θρηνεῖν ζῶσα πρὸς τύμβον μάτην, and *Supp.* 122 : ζῶσα γόοις με τιμῶ, itself copied from *Iliad* Z 500, αἱ μὲν ἔτι ζωὸν γόον Ἕκτορα Ϝῷ ἐνὶ Ϝοίκῳ, I should suppose that Aeschylus repeated some idea of the kind here; ἄπαξ ἔτ' ᾄδειν ἐν ζόοις is perhaps as near the original as we are likely to get.

1536. ψεκὰς δὲ λήγει.

I quite agree with Dr. Verrall that to say 'the shower is ceasing,' when you mean that it is beginning to rain heavily, is downright nonsense. Did not Aeschylus write δ' ἐπείγει, which would be corrupted to our text by practically the change of one letter?

By the way, is not δέδοικα κτύπον in the line above strong enough to defend Askew's correction of the ridiculous κτύπον δέδορκα at *Sept.* 100? Not that much defence can be needed by any one who supposes Aeschylus to have been a rational being.[1]

1594. τὰ μὲν ποδήρη καὶ χερῶν ἄκρους κτένας
* * * * *
ἔθρυπτ' ἄνωθεν ἄνθρακος καθημμένου
ἄσημ'· ὁ δ' αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ.

ἄνθρακος καθημμένου, Housman; ἄσημ'· ὁ δ, Dindorf. I find from Wecklein's Appendix that I am anticipated by Hermann in assuming a lacuna after 1594, but as Hermann himself appears to have given it up, and as at any rate his suggestion has met with no favour since, it may be well to set forth the grounds which make such an assumption necessary.

The dogs which ate Jezebel, ravenous as Oriental dogs are, drew the line at the skull, the palms of the hands, and the soles of the feet. I have been told that the reason is that the hands and feet are exceedingly bitter; anyhow it is obvious that the most accomplished cookery could make little of them, and that they would be as liable to detection as the 'batrachian bones' which

[1] 'You must understand,' says Peter Quince, 'he goes but to see a noise that he heard'; Sir Toby Belch speaks of hearing by the nose; what do the editors of Aeschylus see or hear by?

revealed to a horror-stricken student of zoology what he had been allured into eating in Paris. To suppose that these were precisely the parts chosen by Atreus to set before Thyestes is simply monstrous. Besides we have been told by Cassandra what Thyestes *did* eat:

χεῖρας κρεῶν πλήθοντες οἰκείας βορᾶς
σὺν ἐντέροις τε σπλάγχν', ἐποίκτιστον γέμος,
πρέπουσ' ἔχοντες, ὧν πατὴρ ἐγεύσατο.

Seneca must have surely had the account of Aeschylus in his mind when he produced his *Thyestes*. At the risk of being as sick as the eponymous hero I have reached to the end of that most disgusting of all works calling themselves tragedies, and this is what I find to illuminate our passage:

ipse divisum secat
in membra corpus: amputat trunco tenus
umeros patentes et lacertorum moras,
denudat artus durus atque ossa amputat,
tantum ora seruat et datas fidei manus.
Haec ueribus haerent *uiscera* et lentis data
stillant caminis, illa flammatus latex
candente aeno iactat. (760-767.)
stridet in ueribus *iecur*. (770.)
abscisa cerno *capita* et auulsas *manus*
et rupta fractis cruribus *uestigia*. (1042-3.)

And compare 1063-1067. Can there be any doubt that the details of the Thyestean banquet were the same as those of the banquet of Harpagus in Herodotus (i. 119), except that at the latter there were other guests present who fed upon mutton, while at the former no one was present except Thyestes?

Atreus then kept back head, hands, and feet, the rest he minced up (ἔθρυπτε) so that it should be unrecognizable. One line would be quite enough to fill up the gap, *e.g.*

κάρα τ' ἔκρυψε, σπλάγχνα δὲ ξὺν ἐντέροις

or any other line one likes to make up. Now too we can explain the μὲν of 1594. As the passage stands in the MSS. μὲν is as pointless as the rest is silly

'Part he roasted and part he boiled' says Herodotus, and so Euripides talks of both roasting and boiling in *Cyclops*, 245 *seqq.*, ἀπ' ἄνθρακος | θερμὴν ἑλόντος δαῖτ' ἄτερ κρεανόμου | τὰ δ' ἐκ λέβητος ἑφθὰ καὶ τετηκότα (Housman). So also Seneca as quoted above. If this was copied by Seneca from our passage, it follows that more than one line must be gone, but Aeschylus hurries over the details and probably Seneca, whose revolting imagination is beyond belief, added this *de suo*. Besides there were tragedies enough on Thyestes for him to draw from. We have ὀπτὰς σάρκας however at *Ag.* 1082. But ἔθρυπτε does not suit either ordinary roasting or boiling; what it would suit exactly would be the preparation of a haggis. Compare now the roasting of pork at *Iliad*, ix. 213:

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ πῦρ ἐκάη καὶ φλὸξ ἐμαράνθη,
ἀνθρακιὴν στορέσας ὀβόλους ἐφύπερθε τάνυσσε,

and the cooking of the haggis at *Odyssey*, xviii. 44:

γαστέρες αἴδ' αἰγῶν κέατ' ἐν πυρί,

and the meaning of 'minced over lighted coals' is plain enough. It is a short way of saying: 'minced up as a haggis and cooked over lighted coals.' And—yes, Aeschylus is quite disgusting enough, but I suppose he found it in the story.

The last relic of cannibalism in Greece was the feast of the wolf-god in Arcadia, and the morsel of human flesh was a σπλάγχνον, ἐν ἄλλοις ἄλλων ἱερείων ἓν ἐγκατατετμημένον (Plato, *Rep.* 565 D). The story of Thyestes is likely enough connected with some such ancient festival. The σπλάγχνα were particularly eaten by cannibals because thereby they could gain a portion of the mental qualities of the victim. Thus after the heroic death of Bréboeuf the Indians crowded round to eat his heart that some of that unexampled fortitude might pass into their own. And hence we may perhaps understand how it was that the tradition spoke especially of σπλάγχνα ὧν πατὴρ ἐγεύσατο, and why Aeschylus says ἔθρυπτε here, suggesting just the same ideas as in the passage of Plato quoted above.

Then again I find another legend of cannibalism, with several points of resemblance, in the 200th Orphic fragment (ed. Abel). The Titans, after tearing Dionysus in pieces, λέβητά τινα τρίποδι ἐπιθέντες καὶ τοῦ Διονύσου ἐμβάλλοντες (ἢ ἐμβαλόντες) τὰ μέλη καθήψουν πρότερον· ἔπειτα ὀβελίσκοις περιπείραντες ὑπείρεχον Ἡφαίστοιο. Then Zeus, perceiving the savour τῶν ὀπτωμένων κρεῶν, κεραυνῷ τοὺς Τιτᾶνας αἰκίζεται. Thus Clemens Alexandrinus, and Firmicus Maternus, telling the same story, says: 'decocta variis generibus pueri membra consumunt.' Athena kept the heart, partly 'ut manifestum delationis esset indicium.'[1] So we have

[1] Cp. Proclus, *Hymns*, vii. 11-13.

here a similar confusion of cookery, and an 'indicium' consisting of a part of the victim. A festival was held by the Cretans at which they celebrated the passion of Dionysus, though there does not appear to have been any cannibalism practised as in Arcadia.

ARTHUR PLATT.

NOTE ON AESCH. *PR.* V. 358.

AESCH. *Pr.* v. 358. *Τυφῶνα θούρον πᾶσιν ὃς ἀντέστη θεοῖς.*

Various emendations have been proposed to correct the metre in the MS. text of this line but none are satisfactory. The two which seem most popular *πᾶσιν ὃς ἀνέστη* and *πᾶσι δ' ἀντέστη* give, the former a most ugly rhythm, the latter a most ugly shape of sentence, though it is fair to add that the latter is really part of a larger emendation and ought never to have been taken separately. The suggestion that *ἀντέστη* is a gloss for *προύστη* is more attractive but it would be simpler still to omit ὃς and punctuate

Τυφῶνα θοῦρον· πᾶσιν ἀντέστη θεοῖς

That is, the narrative of what T. did begins with *πᾶσιν*. The absence of connecting relative or particle is perhaps an objection to this suggestion, but I do not think it is conclusive: certainly it is a lesser objection than those which can be brought against the other conjectures quoted.

F. HAVERFIELD.

NOTES ON THUCYDIDES, BOOK VI.

I AM greatly honoured by the remarks contributed by Mr. G. C. Richards to the November number of this Review. Before proceeding to comment on them, I wish to say something about vi. 20 *χρήματά τ' ἔχουσι τὰ μὲν ἴδια, τὰ δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἔστι Σελινουντίοις· Συρακοσίοις δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ βαρβάρων τινῶν ἀπαρχὴ φέρεται.*

Weidner's conjecture [Σελινουντίοις] is accepted by Dr. Hude, but I hope that in his Teubner text he will restore the word to life. Mr. G. A. Papabasileios in Πλάτων, 1884, p. 79, reads the passage thus: *χρήματά τε* [*ἔχουσι*] *τὰ μὲν ἴδια, τὰ δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἔστι Σελινουντίοις* < *καὶ Συρακοσίοις* >. *Συρακοσίοις δὲ καὶ κ.τ.λ.* To be sure, this is just what Thucydides means, but the alterations of the text are wrong; at least the insertion, I am confident, is an error. If the writer had looked at ii. 70, 3, vii. 57, 3, 4, he would have found a similar passage in which a statement that by itself is inaccurate is made clear by an addition that amplifies or corrects that which precedes. The first is *ξυνέβησαν ἐξελθεῖν αὐτοὺς καὶ παῖδας καὶ γυναῖκας καὶ τοὺς ἐπικούρους ξὺν ἑνὶ ἱματίῳ, γυναῖκας δὲ ξὺν δυοῖν.* The other is *τῶν μὲν ὑπηκόων καὶ φόρου ὑποτελῶν . . Μιλήσιοι καὶ Σάμιοι καὶ Χῖοι. τούτων Χῖοι οὐχ ὑποτελεῖς ὄντες φόρου.* It may be replied that in these two passages the first statement is *by inclusion* of too much, whereas in vi. 20 the inaccuracy of the first statement is one of *exclusion* of an essential. Nevertheless the principle is the same: in all a step in the reasoning is omitted: in the one *πλὴν γυναικῶν*, in another *πλὴν Χίων*, in another *καὶ Συρακοσίοις*. There is also i. 17, *ἐπράχθη τε οὐδὲν ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἔργον ἀξιόλογον . . . οἱ γὰρ ἐν Σικελίᾳ ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἐχώρησαν δυνάμεως*, where *πλὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν Σικελίᾳ* is wanting to the first statement, and where Cobet's alluring emendation, *μόνοι γὰρ οἱ ἐν Σικελίᾳ*, is quite superfluous.

I now return to the passages, to my rendering of which Mr. Richards raises objections. And in doing so, I may assure him that I have no other wish than to arrive at the truth. For this purpose I shall proceed experimentally, and will first contrast again my version with Jowett's version (which is the commonly approved version) of c. 89, 6. This passage stands, according to the rearrangement I gave in the October number, as follows:—

ἡμεῖς δὲ τοῦ ξύμπαντος προέστημεν, δικαιοῦντες

ἐν ᾧ σχήματι μεγίστη ἡ πόλις ἐτύγχανε καὶ ἐλευθερωτάτη οὖσα καὶ ὅπερ ἐδέξατό τις, τοῦτο ξυνδιασῴζειν. ἐπεὶ δημοκρατίαν γε καὶ ἐγιγνώσκομεν οἱ φρονοῦντές τι (καὶ αὐτὸς οὐδενὸς ἂν χεῖρον, ὅσῳ κἂν (?) λοιδορήσαιμι· ἀλλὰ περὶ ὁμολογουμένης ἀνοίας οὐδὲν ἂν καινὸν λέγοιτο), καὶ τὸ μεθιστάναι αὐτὴν οὐκ ἐδόκει ἡμῖν ἀσφαλὲς εἶναι. I construe from ἐπεί thus: 'For democracy was both known by us who had sense (and I myself should be inferior to none of us in sense, *i.e.* superior to any, by the amount of abuse I might pour on it: but concerning acknowledged madness nothing new could be said), and to change its character did not seem to us to be safe.'

Now Mr. Richards says that with φρονοίην, I ought to understand, 'By abusing democracy I should be more sensible than you *my hearers*' (the italics are mine). I reply that this cannot be the construe. καὶ αὐτὸς οὐδενὸς ἂν χεῖρον is a parenthetical remark on οἱ φρονοῦντές τι, so that οὐδενὸς must mean in this context οὐδενὸς τῶν φρονούντων τι. I reply further that Jowett's way, the accepted way to which Mr. R. assents, gives precisely the same meaning to οὐδενὸς that I give to it: but in my way, with φρονοίην understood, it is even plainer that not ὑμῶν but τῶν φρονούντων is mentally supplied to οὐδενός. What does Mr. R. supply to ὅσῳ καὶ (μᾶλλον ἄν)? He himself says 'than others.' Why may I not do the same with οὐδενός? I only give to 'others' its obvious meaning when sandwiched between φρονοῦντες and φρονοίην.

Mr. R. says that the sentiment that I attribute to Alcibiades 'would be a very natural thing for him to say,' but that it seems hardly to be got out of the words. When I look at the other ways of taking the passage, I am constrained to say that my rendering comes more easily out of the words than any other. It does not matter whether I construe 'I should *be* more sensible' or render freely 'I should *show* the superiority of my insight'; for the sense is 'We were sensible—and I should be the most sensible of us all were I to abuse (or rebuke, if Mr. R. prefers) it.' How can Mr. R. deny that λοιδορία would here be the outward *sign* of the sense that would be in the man? To say φαινοίμην ἂν φρονῶν would be sheer waste of words, and not at all appropriate in manner to the hurry and impatience of the speaker.

But further, it seems to me strange that nobody attempts to explain why, if οὐδενὸς ἂν χεῖρον (γιγνώσκοιμι) is right, the optative with ἄν is used. How is the *knowledge* of Alcibiades conditional on his indulging in a more violent λοιδορία? His superior *prudence* is conditional upon that: but the *knowledge* he possessed already.

Mr. R. indulges in a mild λοιδορία upon my neglect of the commentary to Jowett, and he says that the parallels cited in the note to Jowett justify the omission of μᾶλλον with ὅσῳ. Most true; but 'omission' is a mere quibble, because any one who looks carefully at the parallels cited will see that μᾶλλον is indeed 'omitted in them,' but does not need to be 'supplied' to make sense. The passages are vi. 92, ὅσῳ τὰ μὲν Ἀθηναίων οἶδα, τὰ δ' ὑμέτερα ἤκαζον, v. 90, ὅσῳ καὶ ἐπὶ μείζονι τιμωρίᾳ κ.τ.λ., and v. 108, ὅσῳ πρὸς μὲν τὰ ἔργα . . ἐγγὺς κείμεθα, τῆς δὲ γνώμης . . πιστότεροι ἑτέρων ἐσμέν. The fact is that after reading the note in Poppo, I not unfrequently find that the note in Jowett may be passed over in silence. This is the case in the present instance; for Mr. R. will find out whence the passages cited in Jowett were obtained, and whence others might have been obtained if he looks in Poppo's *Editio Maxima*. The really important thing to know here is not the note in J., but Hermann's contention that μᾶλλον is to be extracted from χεῖρον, on which I have only to say that all the λοιδορία that Alcibiades might utter would constitute, in the eyes of the Spartans, a claim to φρόνησις superior to the φρόνησις of men who had not uttered any λοιδορία of democracy, but had preferred ξυνδιασῴζειν τὴν δημοκρατίαν.

The second passage is c. 69, 1, where Mr. R. says that the passage will obviously construe in my way; but, he asks, why not render 'Though they did not expect the Athenians to begin the attack, and though they had to defend themselves on the spur of the moment . . nevertheless they took up their arms, etc'? I answer, for the reason that Stahl explains; which is that διὰ τάχους ἀναγκαζόμενοι ἀμύνασθαι connot be *concessive* to ἀναλαβόντες τὰ ὅπλα etc. You might as well say to a burglar in your bedroom '*though* you *compel* me to defend myself on a sudden, *nevertheless* I seize the poker and go for you.' The circumstance is the cause of the act. But what Stahl himself does not see is (1) that οὐκ ἂν οἰόμενοι . . ἐπελθεῖν means 'though they *would not have* been thinking that the A. would suddenly attack them, unless they had seen them actually coming'—the ἄν belonging both to the participle and to the infin.; (2) that καὶ ἀναγκαζόμενοι ἀμύνασθαι depends on οἰόμενοι ἄν. It is therefore just possible that ἄν has dropped out before ἀναγκαζόμενοι, though Hude has written to me objecting thus:

'Si particula ἄν inserta infinitious ad οἰόμενοι referatur, ἀναγκαζόμενοι valde supervacaneum fit.'

Next we have c. 23, 1, where again Mr. R. thinks my construe possible, but prefers a different explanation. He is quite right in his contention that Nicias is comparing the Athenian forces with the combined forces of seven Sicilian cities, and not merely with the forces of Syracuse, as I erroneously stated. But if he looks at Stahl's note, he will see that there are grave objections to taking τὸ μάχιμον τὸ ὁπλιτικόν to mean 'their total strength of hoplites.' Mr. R. says that Nicias is taking a very gloomy view of the comparative forces. How then does he explain μὴ ἀντίπαλον μόνον . . ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπερβάλλοντες τοῖς πᾶσι? That is not a gloomy, but an optimistic estimate. It seems to me clear that Nicias here is granting for the sake of argument that Athens can send a force of infantry able to match the hoplite force of the seven confederated cities. Mr. R. says that such a thing was 'manifestly impossible.' Even if it were so, the impossibility would only increase the force of Nicias' argument, for he would then be assuming an impossibility. But why should not Athens get hoplites from her allies to make up the number required? Classen saw that τὸ ὁπλιτικόν means the Athenian hoplites, and Stahl's objections to him are answered when τὸ ὁπλιτικόν is referred to παρασκευασάμενοι.[1] The only certain impossibility, dismissed contemptuously by Nicias in πλήν γε πρὸς τὸ μάχιμον αὐτῶν, is that Athens should bring a force of hoplites into the field strong enough to counterbalance not merely the hoplites of the seven towns, but the hoplites *with* light-armed troops and cavalry.

In c. 87, 5 I explain τῶν ἡμῖν ποιουμένων as 'our general conduct' instead of 'our enterprise in Sicily.' Mr. R. has altogether the better of me; for von Essen reveals the horrid fact that τὰ ποιούμενα everywhere else in Thuc. means 'what is going on' at the time to which the leading verb refers. The context favours my view; but I cannot maintain it in the face of the parallels.

I am much gratified that my notes on c. 21, 2 and 46, 2 command Mr. Richards' assent, and I only regret that he has not explained why he finds my explanation of c. 87, 4 'unconvincing,' when all other explanations except those that require an alteration of the text have been proved to be impossible.

E. C. MARCHANT.

[1] Since writing the above I have been much gratified to find that Mr. John Argyriades in his κριτικαὶ καὶ ἑρμηνευτικαὶ διορθώσεις explains this passage exactly as I have done.

ON AN EPIGRAM OF LEONIDAS OF TARENTUM, *A.P.* IX. 335.

THE Palatine codex gives this epigram thus:—

Ὑλοφόρου τώγαλμαθ' ὁδοιπόρε Μικαλίωνος
Ἑρμῆς δ' ἁ λί δε τον κρήγυον ὑλοφόρον,
ὡς ἐξ οἰζυρῆς ἠπίστατο δωροδοκῆσαι
ἐργασίης· αἰὲν δ' ὠγαθός ἐστ' ἀγαθός.

τὤγαλμα Planudes.

J. Geffken, in his recently published edition of the *Epigrams of Leonidas of Tarentum* (supplement to Fleckeisen's *Jahrbücher* for 1896, p. 99) writes: 'Die lesart des Planudes τὤγαλμα ist wol die allein berechtigte. Was machen wir mit zwei Bildern? Die Sache liegt so. Mikalion, der arme Holzsammler, widmet ein Hermesbild. Dieses redet: (Das ist) das Bild, Wanderer, vom Holzsammler Mikalion (gestiftet), ein Hermes; siehe aber, wie wacker der Holzsammler ist u.s.w.'

Against this, I would urge that τώγαλμαθ' (*i.e.* τὼ ἀγάλματε = τὤγάλμαθ') has every mark of sincerity. (1) It scans, (2) the dual is intelligible, if we suppose the two figures to be those of the wood-carrier himself and the god Hermes. But whereas the figure of the former is expressed by a genitive (Μικαλίωνος), the latter is in the appositive nominative, Ἑρμῆς, a misunderstanding of which caused the confusion which has got into the immediately following words. For δ' then I would write τ', and accepting Jacob's correction ἀλλ' ἰδὲ τὸν write the distich thus:—

Ὑλοφόρου τὼγάλμαθ', ὁδοιπόρε, Μικαλίωνος
Ἑρμῆς τ'· ἀλλ' ἰδὲ τὸν κρήγυον ὑλοφόρον.

'duae figurae, uiator, lignatoris sunt Micalionis, Mercuriusque: at tu cerne bonum lignatorem quomodo scierit ex misera vitae condicione donum praestare: bonus enim, siue pauper siue diues, semper bonus est.' Hesych. δωροδοκεῖν· δῶρα λαμβάνειν. δωροδοκία· τὸ λαβεῖν ἢ δοῦναι δῶρα.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

NOTE ON *ILIAD* XX. 18.

Υ 18 *τῶν γὰρ νῦν ἄγχιστα μάχη πόλεμός τε δέδηε.*

In these words Poseidon in the great council of the gods on Olympus gives his reason for supposing that Zeus has some communication or proposal to make touching the Trojans and Achaeans. So much is certain: but when the exact nature of the reason alleged comes to be considered, there is much difference of opinion. Consequently another attempt to solve the problem may perhaps be tolerated. At first sight the line seems simple enough. It presents no difficulty except the interpretation of the adverb *ἄγχιστα*. This has been variously dealt with, but never satisfactorily determined. To prove this it becomes necessary to enumerate as concisely as possible the different explanations propounded. There is no need to specify the several advocates and supporters of each by name. *ἐπίφθονον γάρ.*

At the particular moment when Poseidon is speaking there is no actual fighting going on. Both sides are arming for the coming battle, in which Achilles is to appear at last. This circumstance has materially influenced the view of some of the exponents of our line, and therefore must by no means be left out of account.

Some take *ἄγχιστα* in its regular and natural sense of proximity in place. (1) 'For now the fighting and warring of them are kindled at closest quarters.' The Greeks and Trojans are no longer skirmishing, *ἑκας ἱστάμενοι*, but fighting foot to foot and man to man. However, as they had been hard at it with little intermission through several books from E onward, the statement, though lucid enough, scarcely coincides with the facts.

(2) 'The war and the fighting of them are kindled very nigh,' 'valde prope exarsit.' This again is not literally true, for Olympus cannot be accurately described as very near the plain of Troy. And even if it were so, what then?

Dissatisfied with the above, others have taken *ἄγχιστα* to refer to proximity of time, 'almost immediately.' (3) 'The war is very nearly aflame,' 'is just on the point of bursting out,' 'proxime est ut bellum exardescat.' This is perhaps the most popular view, but hardly more adequate than No. 1 to describe the actual situation, considering there has only been a brief lull in the fighting, unless we charitably suppose that exigences of space prevented Homer from inserting *πάλιν* or *πάλιν αὖτις* or words to that effect. There is besides the somewhat grave objection that it is more than doubtful whether *ἄγχι*, though of frequent occurrence, is ever used in the Homeric poems in reference to time. The only example quoted is *τ* 301, where it is quite possible that the local sense is the right one.

Again it is said that the words mean vaguely (4) 'The war has come to a crisis,' a quite suitable sense indeed, for Achilles, as has been already stated, is just on the point of taking a decisive part in the struggle. Unfortunately it cannot be shown that this meaning is expressed at all by *ἄγχιστα δέδηε*. We should rather require *μάλιστα* than *ἄγχιστα*.

It has even been proposed to take this troublesome adverb closely with *τῶν* and to render 'of those who are most closely connected with us,' who are *ἠμίθεοι*, related to ourselves by direct descent. Unfortunately again this construction is quite at variance with Homeric usage, and cannot be entertained for one moment.

In one respect however this last version is worthy of attention. It rightly suggests that *ἄγχιστα* may indicate a proximity to the gods themselves, not a local but a metaphorical one, just as we frequently find it used of close resemblance in *ἄγχιστα ἐοικώς*, etc.

I propose therefore to render: 'For their fighting and battling now flare out with closest interest for us.' 'For 'tis their warfare in full blaze that now most nearly concerns us.' The emphasis lies upon *ἄγχιστα*, which contains the real predication, and not upon *δέδηε*, which merely adds a picturesque touch. *μάχη ἄγχιστα δέδηε* may be translated 'the fiery fight touches us very closely.' The error of No. 4 is that it attempts, if anything, to reverse this emphasis.

Poseidon thinks it likely that the business to be laid before the assembled gods is connected with the war before Troy, because as he says, there is no other subject of such immediate interest to the gods themselves. 'That hotly contested struggle concerns us more nearly than anything else that is happening at the present time in the world below.'

T. L. Agar.

OVID'S *HEROIDES*.

All Ovid's works, except the amatory poems, are now equipped with a decent apparatus criticus. The apparatus to the amatory poems is no more decent than themselves: the three chief MSS containing them were collated by Keil in 1851: his collations were lent to three editors in succession, Merkel Riese and Ehwald, and remain unpublished to this day; for let no one fancy that what stands on pp. xiv—xvi and xx—xxii of Merkel's preface is anything but a string of excerpts. But Korn in the ex Ponto, Korn and Mr Riese in the metamorphoses, Mr Riese and Merkel in the fasti, Mr Ellis in the Ibis, Mr Owen in the tristia, Mr Kunz in the medicamina, Mr Sedlmayer in the heroides, Mr de Vries in the Sappho, have furnished full and exact collations of the principal MSS. Nothing is now lacking but an editor. But Nicolaus Heinsius is dead and buried; and Ovid, in spite of all this new material, is perhaps in a worse condition than he was two hundred years ago.

Merkel and his followers accomplish this result, not merely by depraving the text with a number of bad readings drawn from good MSS, but by two other methods, both efficacious: they expel the emendations of Heinsius, and they insert their own. With few exceptions, of which Mr Palmer is much the most conspicuous, Ovid's modern editors have been unfortunately distinguished by the very least Ovidian qualities in the world: an instinctive distaste for simplicity and a warm affection for the hispid. To read, for instance, the latest German and English texts of the tristia, you would sometimes fancy that the editors had mistaken the meaning of ex Pont. iv 13 19 'Getico scripsi sermone libellum' and supposed the tristia to be the 'libellus' in question. Merkel, whom his adherents call sospitator Ouidii and other such names, and who really did make some good emendations among many bad, is well described by Madvig: 'in textu recensendo iudicii contortioris et ad artificiosa et obscura inclinantis, non ita raro certissimarum emendationum ab aliis factarum contemptor, nouarum inuentor subabsurdarum et prope incredibilium.' Mr Riese is saved by common sense and a comparative purity of taste from the most grotesque excesses of the two Teubner editors, but he is fully their accomplice in their worst offence. It is not that they afford so little illumination themselves: it is that they stand between us and the light. In the 17th and 18th centuries Ovid was as lucky as he is unlucky now. He was intently studied and brilliantly emended by the two greatest of all critics of Latin poetry. The discoveries of those critics are uncongenial to our modern editors, who treat them accordingly. They steadfastly ignore the work of Bentley, and they diligently undo the work of Heinsius.

The heroides have been less unfortunate than any other portion of Ovid's works. They have been edited by Mr Palmer, who, if his judgment is not equal to his genius, has at any rate emended Ovid with more success than any man of this century but Madvig. The MSS have been examined and classified with care and discretion by Mr Sedlmayer in his prolegomena critica 1878. They form three families, the first represented by P (Parisinus 8242 saec. xi), beyond comparison the most important MS, the second by G (Guelferbytanus extran. 260 saec. xii), the third less distinctly by a number of MSS among which E (fragmentum Etonense saec. xi) is the oldest but not the best.

I 13—22.

In te fingebam uiolentos Troas ituros,
nomine in Hectoreo pallida semper eram.
siue quis Antilochum narrabat ab Hectore uictum
Antilochus nostri causa timoris erat,
siue Menoetiaden falsis cecidisse sub armis
flebam successu posse carere dolos.
sanguine Tlepolemus Lyciam tepefecerat hastam,
Tlepolemi leto cura nouata mea est.
denique, quisquis erat castris iugulatus Achiuis,
frigidius glacie pectus amantis erat.

15. The words 'Antilochum ab Hectore uictum' could not in any context represent what happens at Iliad O 583–91, where there is no combat at all, but Antilochus sees Hector coming and instantly runs off into safety. Least of all can that be the reference here, where Penelope is making the most of her fears and *vanquished* must be held to imply *killed:* see the following verses and especially the summary in 21 '*denique* quisquis erat...

iugulatus'. But Antilochus was not killed by Hector. Say it were possible for Ovid to forget not only the Aethiopis but also the express statement of Homer in Od. δ 187 sq. that Antilochus was killed by Memnon: what Ovid could neither forget himself nor hope that his readers would forget is that Antilochus in the Iliad survives Hector and is nowhere so brimful of life as after Hector's death, in Ψ 287–613. The so-called Hyginus indeed in fab. 113 'quem quis occidit' has the words 'Hector Protesilaum, idem Antilochum'. But if that statement is uncorrupt it doubtless comes from this very passage of Ovid, for Ovid is one of Hyginus' authorities. Since however only six lines above in fab. 112 'qui cum quo dimicarunt' he writes 'Antilochus cum Memnone: Antilochus occiditur', and since you expect at least to find Patroclus among Hector's slain, Moriz Schmidt is probably right in assuming some such lacuna as this: 'Hector Protesilaum, idem *Patroclum. Memnon* Antilochum.

But what seems to me an even worse and less credible fault than this contradiction of a notorious story is the penury and resourcelessness of *Hectore* and *nomine Hectoreo* in two consecutive lines. Therefore, instead of such bold expedients as changing Antilochus twice over into Amphimachus or Anchialus, I should write

siue quis Antilochum narrabat ab *hoste*
reuictum.

Thus the three examples taken will refer to the three chief champions of Troy: Memnon, Hector, Sarpedon.

uictum is so common and *reuictum* so rare that the false division (compare trist. i. 9 33 where the best MS. has *turnere lata* for *Turne relata*) is nothing to wonder at: then, under the influence of *Hectoreo* above, *hostere* passed, probably through the transposition *hestore*, into *hectore*. This particular form of error I illustrated in Journ. Phil. vol. xviii pp. 31 sq.: here are more examples: Ovid her. iv 45 *uersare*, *seruare*, ars ii 729 *seruandus*, *uersandus*, (I should add Verg. buc. x 68 *seruemus*, *uersemus*), met. v 246 detrectas, detractes, ex Pont. ii 10 43 absim (read apsim), ipsam, Plaut. rud. 545 ballena, bellana, Sen. Thy. 416 dantem, tandem, Herc. Oet. 496 facilis in species, faciles inspicies, Stat. Theb. ii 311 descisse, discesse, copa 34 prisca, crispa, Cic. ad Att. iv 5 2 facerem, feceram. A close parallel to this corruption of *hostere* by transposition to *hestore* and thence by external influence to *hectore* occurs in her. viii 69 where Ovid wrote *distinet* but our MSS give *destinat:* the mistake began with the spelling *distenet*, which is not very uncommon in MSS as old as P; then came the transposition *destinet*, and then the grammatical correction *destinat:* at Hor. epist. i 2 5 the MSS exhibit a similar sequence in full, *distinet* the true reading, *distenet*, *destinet*, and finally *detinet* to make sense.

The verb 'reuinco' is used once again by Ovid fast. vi 432 'iudicio forma reuicta tua est', once by Horace carm. iv 4 24, thrice by Lucretius i 593, iv 488, v 409. In prose it generally means 'refuto' or 'conuinco', and so it does at Lucr. iv 488; at Lucr. v 409 and in Horace it may mean 'uicissim uinco', but need not; at Lucr. i 593 and in Ovid it seems to mean simply 'uinco'.

II 105–118.

Iamque tibi excidimus; nullam, puto,
Phyllida nosti.
ei mihi, si, quae sim Phyllis et unde,
rogas.
quae tibi, Demophoon, longis erroribus
acto
Threicios portus hospitiumque dedi,
cuius opes auxere meae, cui diues egenti
munera multa dedi, multa datura fui,
quae tibi subieci latissima regna Lycurgi
nomine femineo uix satis apta regi,
qua patet umbrosum Rhodope glacialis
ad Haemum
et sacer admissas exigit Hebrus
aquas,
cui mea uirginitas auibus libata sinistris
castaque fallaci zona recincta manu.
pronuba Tisiphone thalamis ululauit in
illis
et cecinit maestum deuia carmen auis.

Phyllis professes to fear that Demophoon has forgotten her very existence, and proceeds therefore to remind him who she is,—that Phyllis who did him so much kindness, 107 'quae tibi', 111 'quae tibi'. But into the midst of these relatives relating to Phyllis there intrudes the preposterous distich 109 sq., with 'cuius' and 'cui' relating not to Phyllis but to Demophoon; and then after 'quae' for Phyllis in 111 you slip back again to 'cui' for Demophoon in 115: for all the world as if she were explaining to Demophoon who Demophoon was. As for 109 sq., the only way to fit that couplet

for the post it occupies is to write with brutal violence 'cuius opes auxere *tuas, quae* diues egenti' cet. If Ovid put it where it stands he must have written *tuas* and *quae*; but if Ovid had written *tuas* and *quae* the scribes would not have written *meae* and *cui*; therefore Ovid did not put it where it stands. Accordingly Suringar placed 109 sq. after 114: but there they dangle miserably, as 115 sq. already do, from the distant 'tibi' of 111; and they are the merest repetition of what has been said more vigorously above. Madvig, who makes the same transposition, corrects the former vice but does not much disguise the latter by putting a full stop at the end of 114, and writing interrogatively 'cuius opes auxere meae? cui.....datura fui?' I propose therefore to make one slight alteration more. Transpose the distich with Suringar, put a full stop after 114 with Madvig, and proceed with the fresh sentence thus:

cuius opes auxere meae, cui diues egenti 109
munera multa dedi, multa datura fui,
huic mea uirginitas auibus libata sinistris 115
castaque fallaci zona recincta manu.
pronuba Tisiphone cet.

Down to 114 she enumerates her benefits to Demophoon: then she goes on 'the man for whom I did all this and was ready to do more repaid me only by betrayal': 109 sq. sum up, for the purpose of this contrast, what has already been said at length. *cui* in 115 may come from the loss of the initial and the rearrangement of the letters *uic*.

V 81—88.

Non ego miror opes, nec me tua regia tangit,
nec de tot Priami dicar ut una nurus;
non tamen ut Priamus nymphae socer esse recuset,
aut Hecubae fuerim dissimulanda nurus.
dignaque sum et cupio fieri matrona potentis: 85
sunt mihi, quas possint sceptra decere, manus.
nec me, faginea quod tecum fronde iacebam,
despice: purpureo sum magis apta toro.

85. Cupio fieri matrona potentis! With these dignified and persuasive words does Oenone expect to win back her lover. She *wants to marry a person of importance;* Paris is the only such person who happens to be handy; surely then he will not say no. And just five lines above she has declared 'non ego miror opes, nec me tua regia tangit'!

Faber proposed 'dignaque sum *regis* fieri matrona potentis', which effectually mends the sense; and there ought to be no doubt that this indecent *et cupio* is a mere stopgap for some lost word which invested 'potentis' with a clearer meaning. But there is no reason to be seen why *regis* should fall out; and Ovid more likely wrote

dignaque sum fieri *rerum* matrona potentis:

rerum perishing between *ieri* to the left of it and *m* to the right. 'rerum potentis' = 'summo imperio praediti', Lucr. ii 50 and iii 1027 'reges rerumque potentes'.

VI 25—40.

'Aesonides' dixi 'quid agit meus?' ille pudore 25
haesit in opposita lumina fixus humo.
protinus exilui tunicisque a pectore ruptis
'uiuit an' exclamo 'me quoque fata uocant?'
'uiuit' ait. timidum quod amat: iurare coegi.
uix mihi teste deo credita uita tua est. 30
ut rediit animus, tua facta requirere coepi.
narrat aenipedes Martis arasse boues,
uipereos dentes in humum pro semine iactos
et subito natos arma tulisse uiros,
terrigenas populos ciuili marte peremptos 35
inplesse aetatis fata diurna suae.
[deuictus serpens. iterum, si uiuat Iason,
quaerimus. alternant spesque timorque fidem.]
singula dum narrat, studio cursuque loquendi
detegit ingenio uulnera nostra suo. 40

I print this passage as I believe it ought to stand. In 29 the admirable reading of E and a few other MSS, *timidum quod amat*, has already been adopted by Mr Shuckburgh, who compares i 12 'res est solliciti plena timoris amor'. This part of the epistle is

torn out of P: the rest of the MSS have *timidum quod ait* or *timidumque mihi* or the like. Some editors accept Heinsius' conjecture 'uiuit, ait *timidus: timidum* iurare coegi'; but if Heinsius had known of the reading of E he would not have made that conjecture. At 31 Merkel Riese Sedlmayer and Ehwald give *utque animus rediit*, because it is in G: Mr Palmer reads as above with a few MSS, because he is a competent critic. At xiii 29 occur the very same variants, the metrical interpolation *utque animus rediit* in G, the Ovidian *ut rediit animus* in other MSS; but P, which is absent here, is there present, and of course supports the latter. Round goes the weathercock: Merkel and his retinue adopt in that place the true reading which they reject in this and which they would reject again in that if P were absent. They apparently edit ep. vi before they have read ep. xiii, and do not edit ep. xiii until they have forgotten ep. vi.

Merkel Palmer and Ehwald obelise 31–38 as spurious. I know not which to wonder at more: those who think that 37 sq. are Ovid's, or those who think that 31–36 are not Ovid's. 37 sq. are a shameful interpolation, ungrammatical in language, inept in sense, and destructive of coherency; for all they do is to prevent 'singula dum narrat' from following as it ought on the narration, and to make it follow on an interruption of the narration. But as for 31—36, it is really too bad that Ovid should be robbed of these splendid verses because 'they follow too closely after the similar account vs. 10—14'. The repetition is one of his most triumphant feats. In 10—14 he has related the labours of Iason, and you think you never read a more sterling piece of rhetorical description:

isse sacros Martis sub iuga panda boues,
seminibus iactis segetes adolesse uirorum
inque necem dextra non eguisse tua,
peruigilem spolium pecudis seruasse draconem,
rapta tamen forti uellera fulua manu.

Now, to show you how easy it is to him, he relates them over again in new language, and does it even more brilliantly than before: there is no better written couplet in all his works than 35 sq. He stops before he comes to the dragon and the fleece, partly for variety, partly that 'singula dum narrat' may come in the more naturally. The diligent interpolator misses an equivalent to 13 sq. and inserts his precious 'serpens'.

VI 107, 108.

Illa sibi Tanai Scythiaeque paludibus udae
quaerat et a patria Phasidis usque uirum.

Medea might seek a husband *a Phaside* or *a patria sua*, but not *a patria Phasidis*, for there is no such place. Aethiopia is *patria Nili:* the Nile, 'qui patriam tantae tam bene celat aquae' (am. iii 6 40), rises there and flows thence into Egypt. Greece is *patria Alphei*, because Alpheus runs under sea to Sicily; but it is not *patria Eurotae. patria Tiberis* can stand for Etruria or for Vmbria, whichever the Tiber takes its rise in, but for Italy it cannot stand; and *patria Phasidis* is the name for nothing on earth. *patria* is *pria*, which is *ripa* with one letter out of place.

Now will it be believed that this necessary and certain emendation was made long before me by Richard Bentley; that it was published three-quarters of a century ago; and that not one editor of Ovid has accepted it, and only one has even mentioned it? Bentley's emendations are the most important contribution to the criticism of Ovid which has been made since Heinsius. Since they were published in the Oxford edition of 1825–6, many MSS of Ovid have been collated with the utmost diligence; but no collation of any MS since 1826, or indeed since 1661, has helped so much towards purifying the text as Bentley's emendations might have helped. Haupt again and again called attention to their value; but who was Haupt, that an editor of Ovid should listen to him? It is hard to write without bitterness of the loss of time inflicted on an intelligent student by editors who cannot even be trusted to hand down the discoveries which their betters have made. You are reading v 121 in a vulgar text:

dixerat: in cursu famulae rapuere furentem.

dixerat is flatly contradicted by *in cursu rapuere:* you think for a long or a short time, you remember am. i 8 109 or fast. v 245, and you write '*uox erat* in cursu: famulae' cet. And this correction was made by Heinsius and approved by Bentley! and not an editor mentions it except Mr

Sedlmayer, who mentions all Bentley's conjectures, not because he thinks they deserve it, but because the Oxford edition is scarce. There would be no end, if I drew up a list of the places in Ovid where I have been put to the trouble of making Bentley's and especially Heinsius' conjectures over again and wasting hours which might have been profitably employed; but I must quote from the heroides one place more, where the correction is necessary and important and absolutely disregarded: viii 33 sq. 'at pater Aeacio promiserat, inscius acti: | plus *patre, quo* prior est ordine, *pollet* auus' Bentley, for *quoque* (or *quoque qui*)..... *posset* (or *possit*): the editors retain the text, with its meaningless *quoque* and its foolish subjunctive, all except Mr Palmer who introduces a conjecture of his own which is rather impossible than improbable.

Sometimes it is the MS reading that one has to recover by guessing. In xv (Sappho) 129 sq. all the editors print this nonsense:

oscula cognosco, quae tu committere linguae
aptaque consueras accipere, apta dare.

One immediately corrects 'committere (= coniungere) *lingua*', and compares am. ii 5 23 sq. 'inproba tum uero iungentes oscula uidi, | illa mihi *lingua nexa* fuisse liquet'. And *lingua* is the reading of the best MS!

A. E. Housman.

(*To be continued.*)

PLAUTUS, *EPIDICUS* 19 AND 625.

Epid. 19. In my edition of the play I adopted Ussing's reading, viz.:

Thesp. *Quid tibi vis dicam nisi quod est?*
Epid. *Ut id mi responses probe,*
Quid erilis noster filius?

Of the MSS. A has UTILLAERES COSTENTA and B has UTILLIRES PONDI whence Mr. E. W. Fay proposes (*Amer. Journ. of Phil.* xv. 3) *ut illae res cosentant* 'so that your facts may agree.' He thinks that the reading of A may have come from a gloss *constent*, while from a gloss *respondeant* we get B's reading. Plautus *Cas.* 59 has *cosentit* and *cosentant* would stand to *cosentiant* as *evenant* to *eveniant*. But *cosentant* is at least as bold and as uncertain as *responses*, and Leo in his new edition keeps much nearer to the reading of the MSS. by his text *ut illae res? responde.* He accounts for A by supposing it to represent *ostenta pro responde.* I should follow Leo in his text but not in his distribution between the speakers. It seems clear that Epidicus is questioning Thesprio about events at Thebes, to which alone *illae res* can refer. Divide then, Thesp. *Quid tibi vis dicam nisi quod est?* Epid. *ut illae res? responde.* Thesp. *probe.* Then Epidicus follows the general question *ut illae res?* 'how go things generally at Thebes?' to which Thesprio answers *probe*, by the definite enquiry about Stratippocles, v. 20, *quid erilis noster filius?*

Epid. 625.
Ex tuis verbis meum futurum corium pulcrum praedicas.

In A between *pulcrum* and *praedicas* there is a space for two letters and the word wanted is *ut*. *Ex tuis verbis . . ut praedicas* is the regular Plautine idiom and scarcely requires illustration, for a second clause like *ut praedicas* is constantly epexegetic of a phrase like *ex tuis verbis.*

J. H. Gray.

NOTE ON *ALCESTIS*, 320—322.

Conjectural emendation of the text of ancient classics is permissible, if at all, only where the reading is doubtful or the sense unsatisfactory. Let us apply this canon to Professor Earle's treatment of what he calls the 'crux criticorum' in the *Alcestis* of Euripides:—

δεῖ γὰρ θανεῖν με· καὶ τόδ' οὐκ ἐς αὔριον
οὐδ' ἐς τρίτην μοι μηνὸς ἕρχεται κακόν,
ἀλλ' αὐτίκ' ἐν τοῖς μηκέτ' οὖσι λέξομαι.

where (in the November number of the *Classical Review*) he proposes to read:—

οὐδ' ἐς τρίτην μοι μὴν ἐσέρχεται κακόν.

It is not claimed that the reading here is doubtful. Is the sense then unsatisfactory?

I suppose it will be admitted that it would be a perfectly natural thing for Alcestis, knowing that she was to die on the day on which she was speaking, to say that the evil was not coming upon her on the morrow nor on the next day, but at once; and further that, if she were speaking on the first of the month, she might put the third day of the month for the day next but one. It remains then to show that she was speaking on the first day of the month, and that the audience are supposed to know it.

The conception of death as a debt owed by mortals is common in all literature. We need not go further than the same play to find it—

βροτοῖς ἅπασι κατθανεῖν ὀφείλεται.

Now this idea was evidently present to the mind of Euripides in the prologue, who there invests the King of Terrors with the odious characteristics of a usurer, whose ways are:—

To mortals hateful and by gods abhorred.

Death, inexorable creditor that he is, comes on the first of the month to claim his due.

St. George Stock.

Oxford.

MAGICAL PAPYRI.

1. In Mr. Riess's notes, (*Classical Review*, Dec. 1896 p. 410) citing Par. 213–14. (We. i. 51), occurs ἀμφιέσθητι λευκοῖς ἱμᾶσιν. 'But as nobody can dress in straps, we must read εἵμασιν. Still ἱμᾶσιν might be explained as meaning the narrow linen strips, in which mummies were wrapped.' May the reference not be to the binding of the 'recipient'? Mr. Myers, (*Classical Essays*, p. 88) cites, for this world-wide magical practice, oracles in Eusebius, *Pr. Ev.* 8: 'The recipient was in some way bound with withes, and enveloped in fine linen, which had to be cut and unwrapped at the end of the ceremony.' I have compared the Australian magical usage, 'the head, body, and limbs wound round with stringy bark cords,' and similar usages among the Red Indians.

2. πλῆκται = knocking or rapping ἥρωες = souls, are, of course, still very common. (Par. 1079).

3. Pap. R(ainer) l. 34 ff. ὑποκλοπὴν. Mr. Riess says 'stealthy theft, of what?' and suggests, of babies, changelings being substituted. Probably the meaning is, theft of portable objects. Many 'cases' will be found in the Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research, and others may be studied in Nevius's *Demon Possession in China*. The objects in haunted houses vanish, and turn up in unlooked for places. Witch Trials, Glanvil, and other sources provide endless examples. These phenomena are so familiar, in modern experience, (of course the trick is easily played) that ὑποκλοπή hardly needs another explanation. Mr. Riess will find crowds of instances in an American book of 1888, *The Great Amherst Mystery*. A well observed case is recorded from his own experience, by an eminent Catholic missionary in Tonquin. (*circ.* 1730). The πνεύματα in a haunted house were throwing stones about. 'Why don't you throw money?' asked a native Christian, and a handful of copper coins, *all wet*, dropped in the room. On leaving the house, after doing his exorcism, the reverend Father found a water-seller bewailing him-

self in the street. He had lost his money, which he had put in an empty water pitcher. The Father asked him to describe the coins, which were, in fact, the wet ones thrown by the local *πνεύματα*. If this is not *ὑποκλοπὴ*, what is? At a distance from my books, I cannot give the exact reference, but I can procure it.

4. Same citation:—

πνεύματα ἢ κλαίοντα ἢ γελωνια φοβερὰ, (*sic*) *i.e. γελῶντα φοβερά.* No need to go to Grimm, Sagen, no. 224! The Wesley case (1716) and Miss Rose Morton's 'Record of a Haunted House' (*Proceedings*, S. P. R.) will supply *πνεύματα κλαίοντα*. For *γελῶντα φοβερά* I can provide an instance. The house and lands of an ancient family were sold, some thirty years ago, and purchased by acquaintances of my own. The local *πνεῦμα* always laughed horribly at the death of the squire. My friends, being new people, expected no such thing, but, when their father died, the *πνεῦμα* 'laughed consumedly,' as they told me.

Πνεύματα have learned nothing, and forgotten nothing, since the *Magical Papyri* were written. They should be edited by a Mage, or, at all events, by somebody who knows the modern parallels.

ANDREW LANG.

DEBATE IN THE SENATE, AS TO THE RESTORATION OF PTOLEMY AULETES, A.U.C 698 (B.C. 56)

'PROXIMA erat Hortensii sententia, cum Lupus, tribunus pl., quod ipse de Pompeio retulisset, intendere coepit, ante se oportere discessionem facere quam consules. Eius orationi vehementer ab omnibus reclamatum est; erat enim et iniqua et nova. Consules neque concedebant, neque valde repugnabant, diem consumi volebant; id quod est factum: perspiciebant enim in Hortensii sententam multis partibus plures ituros, quamquam aperte Volcatio adsentirentur. *Multi rogabantur, atque id ipsum consulibus invitis; nam ii Bibuli sententiam valere cupierunt.*'

Cic. *Ad. Fam.* I. 2. § 2.

The traditional interpretation refers *ii* to *consulibus;* this makes *invitis* difficult, for if the consuls wished to waste the day, because their own inclinations were for the motion of Bibulus, the course which they took would suit their purpose very well. It would not matter which side the *multi* supported, in that case, because the day would be wasted, as the consuls wished it to be. Hence many editors read *consulibus non invitis*, but there is no authority for the insertion *non*.

I propose to refer *ii* to *multi*. Grammatically, if there is any difference between the two interpretations, it is slightly in favour of the latter, but in Cicero's epistolary Latin, this cannot be insisted upon. The situation in the Senate, I interpret as follows: the consuls were at the very beginning of their year of office, and were rather feeling their way in the Egyptian question. The one thing certain in their minds was a desire not to offend Pompeius, as they were nearly sure to do, if they allowed the matter to be pressed to a further division. Hence they wanted to waste time—*diem consumi volebant*—and this they did by asking for *sententiae* on the demand of Lupus. But this very course—*id ipsum*—though the only one possible, with a view to wasting time, the consuls pursued reluctantly—*invitis*—because the senators, who thus gave their *sententiae*, let it be seen at the same time that they were strongly in favour of the proposal of Bibulus. This can be supported from *Ad. Fam.* I. 1 § 3. *Huic* (i.e. *Bibulo*) *adsentiuntur reliqui consulares, praeter Servilium... et Volcatium...et Afranium.* The consulars would naturally be asked first, and would, as a whole, be for the proposal of Bibulus. Their assertion of this fact would be unwelcome to the consuls, both because it would tend to force the matter to a division, and because this support of an already rejected motion would confuse the consuls as to the general inclinations of the senate. And if the force of *multi* be pressed, I am inclined to think that the Senate were so uncertain in their intentions, that, once the lead was given, they would rather speak in favour of an already rejected motion, than give open support to any other motion as yet undecided, while the wishes of Pompeius were so uncertain as Cicero represents them to have been.

The sentence preceding the one under discussion, *perspiciebant enim...adsentirentur*, must be considerably discounted. Cicero is

here writing to Lentulus Spinther; but in a letter to Quintus (*Ad. Quint. Fratr.* II. 2) written only two days later, he says, *Sine dubio res a Lentulo remota videtur esse.*

It is unfortunate that the wishes of the consuls cannot be accurately discovered. Lentulus Marcellinus later on in this year opposed Pompeius, but the fact that Cicero mentions this as his one objection to Marcellinus (*Ad. Quint. Fratr.* II. 4. § 5) would seem to show that it was rather a sudden development, and that at the beginning of the year, at any rate, Marcellinus was not against Pompeius (cf. Drumann. Vol. II. sub 'Claudii Marcelli' no. 31). Marcius Philippus is still more an unknown quantity. He was deliberately passed over, on the assignment of provinces in 49 B.C. (Caesar *B.C.* I. 6), and would therefore seem to have been insignificant in politics: he tried to dissuade Octavius from entering on his inheritance (Velleius Paterculus, II. 60, Suet. *Aug.* 8 Appian *B.C.* III 10, 13, cf. Cic. *ad Att.* XIV. 12) and disgraced himself when sent as ambassador to Antony at Mutina (Cic. *Ad Fam.* XII. 4, *Phil.* VIII 10, IX. I.) and would therefore seem to have been hesitating, cautious, and incompetent.

If the reference of *ii* to *multi* is satisfactory from a political point of view, it may perhaps be of some use, as obviating the necessity of inserting *non* before *invitis*.

R. H. Gretton.

Magdalen College, Oxford.

ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF οὐ μή.

In the April number of this review, I ventured to criticise Prof. Goodwin's view of the construction οὐ μή, basing my objections (i) on usage and (ii) on meaning. As my criticism was confined to a particular theory, questions (such as whether μή after δείδω is interrogative) which would not affect the validity of my argument whichever way they may be decided, were left in abeyance, nor was more than a passing reference made to the double negative theory of οὐ μή+Fut. I agreed with Prof. Goodwin wherever possible, in order to emphasise the fact that even on his own premises his theory is untenable. To this method Mr. Whitelaw has taken exception. He justly objects to an explanation, with which he is satisfied, being dismissed as 'very improbable,' 'unphilosophical' or 'absurd' without further argument; and though personally I am only guilty of using the first and mildest of these epithets, I should certainly not have employed it without arguments in justification, had I known that this theory, which I had long believed obsolete, still claimed adherents. With such apology by way of introduction, I propose now to examine the theory as expounded by Mr. Whitelaw. In his own words it is thus briefly stated 'οὐ μενεῖς; = μένε,' (therefore) 'οὐ μὴ μενεῖς; = μὴ μένε' (p. 239a). (i) But why is the combination οὐ μὴ and not οὐκ οὐ? Mr. Whitelaw offers no explanation; does he hold the view that since οὐκ ἔστι; = is it not so? therefore οὐ μή ἐστι; will mean 'is it so'? I suppose he does; or if not, what limitations does he lay down to the possibility of double negatives? I can imagine none, unless he supposes that the μή is due to false analogy with the μή in μή μένε. But it is hardly probable that scholars will be prepared to shift so heavy a burden on the already well-laden back of 'false analogy.' I am of course not unaware that attempts have been made to explain this μή on other lines, but it does not appear that Mr. Whitelaw would accept such explanations. For instance Dr. Verrall in a note on Aesch. Sept. 236, says that 'a sensitive ear' requires the change; a double οὐ was also objectionable for grammatical reasons and so μή was substituted. From Dr. Verrall's note one would suppose that there was dire necessity compelling the Greeks to adopt a construction of the 'will you not not-talk,' type, and that as their sensitive ears revolted at the double οὐ, aesthetic taste got the better of grammar and they substituted μή for the second οὐ. I cannot agree with this view. 'Will you not not-talk' sentences do not appear to me indispensable in any language. So cumbrous a form of sentence would never, I believe, have even occurred to the Greek mind, certainly it is unlikely that grammar would have been sacrificed in an effort to retain it. For after all, if I wish to negative 'it is not raining," I simply say 'it is raining,' and similarly the negative of οὐ περιόψεσθέ με; (Leave me alone) is not οὐ μή or οὐκ οὐ περιόψεσθέ με; but simply περιόψεσθέ με; (Don't leave me alone). Scepticism on this point may be removed by reference to Ar. Ach. 55.

(ii) Mr. Whitelaw admits that 'if it were

proved that οὐ μὴ λαλήσῃς could be used in the prohibitive sense,' (p. 239b) his theory would break down. But 'Prof. Goodwin quotes only two examples of this' (p. 240a) which remind Mr. Whitelaw of stage armies. Though Prof. Goodwin confined himself to two instances, it will be found on reference to any critical edition of Aristophanes that in all cases but one, the vast majority, and in some cases, the whole body of MSS prefer the Aor. to the Fut. form, in those passages where both are metrically possible. It is a real army of facts and not a stage army which is arrayed against Mr. Whitelaw. Morever it is impossible to admit his argument that if in Ar. Nub. 296 ποιήσεις was incorrectly written ποήσῃς, 'this would *necessitate* the further error of σκώψῃς for σκώψει' (p. 240a). Consistency is nothing accounted of among scribes; for example in Ar. Nub. 505 the one instance of MSS. preponderating in favour of ἀκολουθήσεις (not ῃς), there is an equally strong preponderance of the same MSS. in favour of the coordinated λαλήσῃς (not εις) in the same line. Therefore I cannot but feel that the MSS. σκώψῃς is inexplicable, except on the supposition that it is correct.

For these reasons I find no difficulty in agreeing with Prof. Goodwin and Prof. Jebb in regarding a theory which offers no explanation of the μή and pays no respect to MSS. authority as both 'unphilosophical' and 'absurd.'

Although it does not appear necessary in view of the foregoing argument to examine in detail Mr. Whitelaw's evidence, it is perhaps worth pointing out that one of the three crutches by which he attempts to support his view is a broken reed. The strength of his argument consists, he says, of a number of sentences of three forms, one of which called C. is as follows οὐ μὴ μενεῖς, ἀλλ' ἀπεῖ, μηδὲ λαλήσεις (*e.g.* Bacch. 343). What, he asks a little later, is to be done with sentences of this form? But there are no sentences of this form. There is one sentence, and only one, (Bacch. 343) which approximates to it, having δὲ and not ἀλλὰ in the middle clause, which makes a considerable difference in respect to the probability of the parenthesis theory. Of course if sentences of this (supposed) type were found, Mr. Whitelaw's theory would gain a greater degree of likelihood, because frequent use of parenthesis in such sentences would be improbable, but the actual absence of such sentences is, if anything, an argument against his view.

Turning to Mr. Whitelaw's criticism of my paper, and his own view of οὐ μὴ in denials, I wish to remove a misconception. He says (p. 242b) 'I cannot think that Mr. Chambers' view that μή with independent subj. in Homer has never parted with its prohibitive force will find acceptance.' So far from propounding a new theory for the acceptance of scholars, I was merely quoting the already accepted view of Mr. Monro, the greatest authority on the subject, who never translates μὴ + indep. subj. other than prohibitively.

Dividing my criticism as before into (i) usage and (ii) meaning, I have in reference to (i) only to repeat my statement that if any one of the existing instances of cautious statements be negatived by prefixing οὐ, or if any one of the existing instances of οὐ μὴ be made affirmative by the omission of οὐ, a construction is produced in support of which no instances can be adduced. Mr. Whitelaw says the second part of this criticism is accidentally true, and the first untrue; and he proceeds to quote an example of οὐ μὴ οὐ from Thucyd. II 93. The quotation, if I may thus call a loose paraphrase, is not to the point. No editor to whom I have access, and I have consulted most of the leading commentators, German and English, takes the passage in the way Mr. Whitelaw proposes. I cannot think that Mr. Whitelaw is justified in contradicting a statement of mine which was based on a most careful search and thus practically accusing me of the gross carelessness of neglecting to look through such an author as Thucydides, on what ground? Merely on the interpretation which he and he alone puts on one solitary passage.[1] If however the fact that the two constructions are never interchangeable in the way described is merely an accident, I am content to rest my case wholly on the second objection, viz. that grounded on meaning.

(ii) Herein I am encouraged by the fact that Mr. Whitelaw thinks I have 'successfully exposed' a similar weakness in Prof. Goodwin's view, to turn the same weapons against Mr. Whitelaw himself. According to the theory under review, the history of the meaning of μή is that it is 'a "not" which avoids assertion,' expressing a mental misgiving, from which it acquired a new meaning of 'perhaps' or possibly' and finally the sentence becomes an assertion of possibility. This possibility is negatived by οὐ and a strong denial is the result. Plausi-

[1] The passage from Philebus 12 D has obviously no bearing on my statement; I cannot understand why it has been quoted.

ble as this sounds, a moment's thought reveals that it is a mere piece of jugglery with the word 'possibly.' Let us take an instance; μὴ διαφθείρῃ perhaps she will destroy, she will possibly destroy, οὐ μὴ διαφθείρῃ she will not possibly destroy, she cannot destroy. In the first, the 'possibly' is subjective, the speaker expresses personal *mental* misgiving, apprehension, avoidance of assertion etc.; in the second the 'possibly' is objective, the speaker denies the capability of some one else to perform an action. The ambiguity could only arise with a word like the English 'possibly' which bears two perfectly distinct meanings. So far Prof. Goodwin and Mr. Whitelaw fare alike, but Mr. Whitelaw takes a second plunge into the slough, which Prof. Goodwin had carefully avoided. 'The οὐ,' says Mr. Whitelaw, 'does negative a *word of apprehension*,' (p. 241b) it negatives 'simply and solely the adverb μή,' (p. 242a) which as he tells us elsewhere means 'perhaps.' There can be no harm therefore in substituting one adverb for another, if they are synonymous. Let us therefore in (*e.g.*) Crito 44 B. substitute ἴσως for μή and thus obtain οἷον ἐγὼ οὐδένα ἴσως ποτὲ εὑρήσω. The only possible translation of this is 'I shall perhaps never see his like again,' but the original undoubtedly means 'I certainly shall not.' It is obvious and requires no further demonstration that the οὐ could only negative 'simply and solely' the μή, if it was always the word immediately preceding the μὴ and further was never compounded. Negatives negative individual words with which they are closely joined, or clauses; they cannot negative some word picked out arbitrarily anywhere in the sentence.

In conclusion, I am quite ready to grant that no theory of οὐ μή is completely satisfactory; sentences of the class of Soph. Aj. 75 do present difficulties to the view to which I am myself inclined. My object in the original paper was not so much to set up any theory of my own, as to urge the rejection of one widely accepted doctrine, which in my opinion was educationally detrimental, being founded on a confusion of thought.

C. D. Chambers.

ON THE MEANING OF *AD* IN *AD OPIS* AND SIMILAR EXPRESSIONS.

The question raised in this number by Miss Sellers in the interesting review of Bornecque's work, may perhaps be most readily answered by an assembly of passages which I have gathered for comparison. These will, I think, show that an invariable distinction between *ad Opis* and *in aede Opis* cannot be maintained even for Ciceronian usage, though it is likely that it was observed by careful writers in speaking of such matters as the position of statues.

We have a number of passages in Cicero referring to the treasure in the temple of Ops, seized by Antony after Caesar's death. The passage cited by Miss Sellers (*Phil.* i. 7, 17) stands on the same ground as *Phil.* ii. 14, 35 'qui maximo te aere alieno ad Opis liberasti,' and *ad Att.* xiv. 14, 5 'Rapinas scribis ad Opis fieri.' It can hardly be doubted that the place in question was inside some building, not in the open air; and it might be suggested that, inasmuch as we know little about the temple of Ops we may assume the treasury to have been an annex to the temple and *therefore* to be described as 'ad Opis.'

But this idea becomes untenable upon a comparison of the following passages: *Phil.* ii. 37, 93 'ubi est septies millies sestertium, quod in tabulis quae sunt ad Opis patebat'; *Phil.* viii. 9, 26 'Ne tangantur rationes ad Opis, id est ne septies millies recuperetur'; *Phil.* v. 6, 15 'direptio eius pecuniae cuius ratio in aede Opis confecta est.' It is surely impossible that the place designated by *in aede Opis* in the last passage can be different from that which is designated by *ad* Opis in the two preceding.

The same apparent possibility of using *ad* [*aedem*] and *in* [*aede*] with no practical difference of meaning comes out in another class of examples which refer to meetings of the Senate: for what distinction can be traced in the following passages: *Phil.* i. 13, 31 'in aede Telluris senatus fuit'; *ad Att.* xvi. 14, 'multo firmius acta tyranni comprobatum iri quam in Telluris[1]'; *ad Q. Fr.* ii. 3 'Senatus ad Apollinis fuit?' The meeting was, no doubt, within the building; but a conventional use of *ad* is allowed,

[1] It is strange, by the way, that no grammar, as far as I know, mentions the use of the elliptic genitive following *in*, and the rules are worded as if it were used only after *ad*.

corresponding to the use of *ad villam* of persons at home in their country house 'ad villam est Tullius' (*pro Tull.* 20).

And in this liberty of choice Livy concurs. Compare the following: xxxiv. 43 'Iis extra urbem in aede Apollinis senatus datus est'; xxvi. 21, 'Senatus ad Bellonae datus est' (so also xxx. 21, xxxiii. 24); xxxi. 47, 'Senatum in aede Bellonae habuit'; xxxix. 4, 'ad aedem Apollinis in senatu quum...disseruisset'; xli. 17, 'senatus in aede Apollinis legatorum verbis auditis.'

The conclusion which seems to me to follow the consideration of these passages is that *ad*, in the expression *ad Opis*, etc., corresponds to our use of *at* in similar connexion; and that it was probably used with much the same limitations: *i.e.* just as we can say, 'there was a debate *at* St. Stephen's' or '*in* St. Stephen's'; so-and-so preached '*at* St. Paul's' or '*in* St. Paul's'; the accounts can be inspected '*at* the Bank of England' or '*in* the Bank of England,' so *ad* (strictly, like the English *at*, implying 'in the neighbourhood of') can be used conventionally, where the sense is plain, with an accusative or with the elliptic genitives *Opis*, *Apollinis*, etc. to describe the place of meetings, etc. within the temples, and not *merely* for something which went on near them.

But there is a limitation usually observed in the use of the English preposition. We should say 'there is a monument of Nelson in St. Paul's' not 'at St. Paul's'; and I am inclined to think that, for the same reason (*i.e.* for greater precision, where there might be a misunderstanding), there is a similar limitation in the use of *ad*, and that when a statue, for instance, is described as being 'ad Opis' it is defined as standing beside it, *not* inside.

A passage of the *Verres* (iv. 16, 36) seems to fall in with this conjecture: 'Domus plena signorum...multa ad villas tuas posita.' The statues would almost certainly be inside the town house, but they well might be in the gardens of the country house; and I think it fairly safe to conclude that the statues mentioned in the letter *ad Q. Fr.* iii. 1, 14, 'ad Telluris tuam statuam locavi;' in *ad Att.* vi. 1, 7, 'ea statua quae ad Opis per te posita in excelso' (if that is the right reading), and those which Marcellus placed 'ad aedem Honoris et Virtutis' (*Verr.* iv. 54, 121) were all outside the temples.

The usage of Pliny tends to strengthen this surmise, for there is, I think, some indication that he is precise in the localisation of statues. Let us take the two chapters about bronze and marble statues, from which Miss Sellers has cited some examples. The various statues whose place is mentioned are thus located by Pliny: 'in Campo Martio,' 'in Capitolio,' 'in bibliotheca templi Augusti,' 'ante Martis Ultoris aedem,' 'in Parthenone' (of the Athene), 'in Titi imperatoris atrio,' 'apud Circum Maximum in aede Pompei Magni,' 'ad aedem Fortunae,' 'ante Thermas [Agrippae],' 'Trophonii ad oraculum,' 'ante Felicitatis aedem,' 'in aede Concordiae,' 'ante aedem Jovis tonantis,' 'in Concordiae templo,' 'in templo Pacis,' 'juxta rostra' (xxxiv. §§ 40–93), 'in Palatina aede Apollinis in fastigio,' 'Athenis in Ceramico,' 'in hortis Servilianis,' 'in Palati delubro,' 'intra Octaviae porticus in Junonis aede,' 'delubro Cn. Domiti in circo Flaminio,' 'in templo Bruti Callaeci,' 'in templo Apollinis Sosiani,' 'in Curia Octaviae,' 'in Saeptis,' 'in Palatio Apollinis delubro,' 'Ephesi in templo Dianae post aedem,' 'ad Octaviae porticum in delubro [Apollinis],' 'ad aedem Felicitatis,' 'in columnis templi eius [Panthei],' (xxxvi. §§ 11–39).

It seems a fair inference that, although, in speaking of assemblies of the Senate, etc., where there is no risk of ambiguity, *ad aedem* and *in aede* are interchangeable, yet in the case of statues, which could be placed either inside or outside, it may be assumed that when Pliny (or Cicero) says *ad*, he does not mean inside; and it is not unlikely that he is precise also in his use of *ante* for 'in front of' and *ad* for 'beside' or near.'

It is possible that some scholar, who has made a more exhaustive and careful examination of authorities (*inter alia*, of inscriptions) than I have had time to make for this note, may be able to throw further light upon the question.

G. E. Marindin.

JEBB'S *AJAX*.

The first feeling of all who care for Greek as they turn the pages of this volume must be one of lively satisfaction that Prof. Jebb has been enabled to see the end of his fourteen years' labour on Sophocles' extant plays. With another volume, containing the fragments, this great edition will be complete. But though the fragments, in Prof. Jebb's accomplished hands, will be by no means wanting in interest and instruction to the special student, there will naturally be less scope for many of the qualities that constitute the peculiar distinction of this editor's work. It is the rare combination of knowledge, accuracy, and judgment, with literary subtlety, poetic insight, and lucid and cogent exposition, which have made Prof. Jebb so masterly an interpreter of this great poet and finest of artists.

The Introduction is unusually elaborate and interesting. The history of the myth, with its early and intricate variations, is traced from Homer downwards. Much ingenuity is shown in the reconstruction of Aeschylus' trilogy on the subject, from scattered fragments, scholia, and chance mentions in other authors. Here Prof. Jebb is able to use the labours of other scholars, notably Welcker: but his own contributions are not insignificant. Particularly (for example) he notices the emphasis and detail (in Sophocles' play) with which both chorus and Aias dwell on the grief which Eriboia will feel at her son's death; and suggests that here we have a reference to κομμοὶ in Aeschylus' third play, 'The Salaminian Women,' where the very title points to the importance of Eriboia's part.

But the main interest of the introduction lies in the new light thrown on the old questions, 'Does not the modern reader feel the prolongation of the play after the hero's death to be an anticlimax?', and, 'Must not the ancient spectator have felt the same?' The ordinary answers lay stress on the importance to a Greek mind of burial: but Prof. Jebb contends with much force that more than this is required if the poet is to be completely justified. Substantially his view may thus be summarized: to the modern reader, Aias is only a man, whose tragic fortunes and suicide form the real drama; while, to the Athenian spectator, he was also a sacred national hero, worshipped with divine honours. Thus the human interest, which to us is everything, was to them necessarily second to the religious interest, which made his *burial* and not his *death* the real climax. For (in a word) the centre of the hero-cult is the tomb; and before he can become χθόνιος he must at least be honourably buried.

Prof. Jebb further argues that the Cambridge representation in 1882 showed the play capable of 'holding an audience.' There is no doubt that individual spectators were surprised to find how well the interest was sustained after Aias' death: the hero's body lying on the stage, the weeping wife and child, the generous pleading of the friend and brother—these visible tokens of the real issue certainly affected the minds of those who watched the scene more powerfully than any but the most imaginative are touched by reading the words. But the verdict of an audience so artificial, so imperfectly following, and so pledged to approval, cannot be really felt to carry much weight —even if there were any certain means of arriving at it.

The text of the Aias is, on the whole, perhaps sounder than that of any other play of Sophocles: but there are a few serious corruptions and several minor difficulties to deal with. Prof. Jebb rejects three lines (554, 571, and 1417) where interpolation is obvious and generally allowed. Against the murderous excisions of Nauck, who blacks out Sophocles like a Russian censor (condemning fifty-nine lines altogether in this play), he makes as usual a firm stand. In this last volume he 'is thankful to observe a reaction setting in' against such reckless mutilation; and the reader will certainly credit the fine taste and sane judgment of this editor with no small share in this reaction. His own emendations in this play are few. We may mention τοιοῖσδ' ὁμοῦ πέλας for τοῖσδ' (405), an extremely simple alteration which sets the metre right, and is decidedly preferable to Lobeck's more ingenious τίσις δ' ὁμοῦ πέλει, where the order of thought is harshly broken. In 869 the Hemichorion searching for Aias are reported by the MSS. as saying:—

πᾷ γὰρ οὐκ ἔβαν ἐγώ;
κοὐδεὶς ἐπίσταταί με συμμαθεῖν τόπος.

i.e. '*Where have I not been? And no place*

is aware that I share its knowledge [where he is].'

This is rather too obscure for a simple sailor, even in a Sophoclean lyric: and the editor suggests *σφε συνναίειν* for *με συμμαθεῖν*, i.e. '*no place knows that he is there*,' which is certainly an improvement in sense.

In all the corrupt places where the corrections of previous scholars are adopted, the grounds are stated with a precision and fulness which, amid the bewildering multitude of conjectures, are most helpful, and which frequently throw new light on the difficulty. Thus on the well-known passage (601):—

παλαιὸς ἀφ' οὗ χρόνος
ἰδαία μίμνων λειμωνία ποίαι μήλων
ἀνήριθμος αἰὲν εὐνόμαι. (The reading of L.)

we have an admirable statement, unfortunately too long to quote, justifying the adoption of the following compound correction from Lobeck, Hermann, and Bergk:—

Ἰδαῖα μίμνων λειμώνι' ἔπαυλα μηνῶν
ἀνήριθμος αἰὲν εὐνῶμαι.

In 1281 [where Teukros is replying to Agamemnon's empty boast that Aias was not so remarkable after all—*ποῦ βάντος ἢ ποῦ στάντος οὗπερ οὐκ ἐγώ;*] the MSS. give:—

ὃν οὐδαμοῦ φὴς οὐδὲ συμβῆναι ποδί,

which was not at all what Agamemnon had said, even if it is good Greek. Prof. Jebb adopts the most ingenious conjecture of J. Krauss:—

ὃν οὐδαμοῦ φής, οὗ σὺ μή, βῆναι ποδί,

which is an accurate quotation of Agamemnon's taunt, and extremely near the MSS. text.

Two well-known passages remain where there is at least *prima facie* ground to suspect interpolation. These are (1) Aias' curse on the Atreidae (839–42), and (2) Teukros' reference to Hektor (1030) as 'gripped by the girdle to the chariot-rail and mangled till he breathed out his life.' The first passage runs as follows:—

καί σφας κακοὺς κάκιστα καὶ πανωλέθρους
ξυναρπάσειαν, ὥσπερ εἰσορῶσ' ἐμέ
αὐτοσφαγῆ πίπτοντα, τὼς αὐτοσφαγεῖς
πρὸς τῶν φιλίστων ἐκγόνων ὀλοίατο.

No one defends the last two lines: for *τὼς* is not Sophoclean, *φιλίστων* is not a Greek word, Agamemnon was not slain by his son, and Menelaos 'lived happily ever after.' The critics are divided between those who reject all four lines (Dindorf, Cobet, and others) and those who follow Bothe and Hermann in rejecting only the last two. Prof. Jebb argues with much ingenuity in favour of the latter, on the two grounds that the scholiast, properly interpreted, rather supports the genuineness of the two first lines, and that the curse on the army, which follows, would be too abrupt unless the Atreidae had been cursed previously. These points deserve consideration; but perhaps the editor has rather overlooked the weakness of ending the sentence with *ὥσπερ εἰσορῶσ' ἐμέ*, leaving the important idea (*ξυναρπασθέντα*) understood. I would even urge that Prof. Jebb feels this himself: for (by a suggestive inadvertence) the words 'even as they behold me' are *included in the interpolation*, both on p. 131 in the translation and again in the introduction on p. xxxix.

In the second passage (1030) the editor's defence will probably be felt to be successful, in spite of the grave difficulty that the story contradicts the very climax of the *Iliad*. Particularly noticeable is the subtle and true distinction he draws (Appendix, 235) between an elaborate narrative conflicting with Homer, which would be improbable, and an incidental reference involving a different story, which is conceivable. He might have added that the lines themselves, with their powerful and finished phrasing, remind one much more of Sophocles than of the interpolator.

One line which is certainly corrupt (799):—

τήνδε δ' ἔξοδον
ὀλεθρίαν Αἴαντος ἐλπίζει φέρειν

Prof. Jebb leaves unaltered (and even unobelized) in the text, though he pronounces it impossible. He follows Blaydes' emendation *ὄλεθρον εἰς Αἴαντος*, though preferring the other order (*Αἰ. ε. ὀ.*). It may, however, be argued that Blaydes' order better accounts for the corruption. In any case the corrupt line should disappear from the text.

With regard to interpretation, and verbal and grammatical comment, there is in this volume a mass of careful and instructive work; but we have only space for a few select specimens, including some where we venture to differ from the editor.

By far the finest example in the book of acute and telling criticism is the long discussion (in the introduction, p. xxxii.) on the last speech of Aias to Tekmessa (646—692). Between the opposed opinions, that it is 'all dissembling,' and that there 'is no intention to mislead,' Prof. Jebb takes an intermediate view. We can only here say that even those who differ from the conclusion will recognize the illuminating insight and power with which the case is put.

On the beautiful yet difficult lines (475–6):—

> τί γὰρ παρ' ἦμαρ ἡμέρα τέρπειν ἔχει
> προσθεῖσα κ'ἀναθεῖσα τοῦ γε κατθανειν

we have an admirably full and clear explantion in the notes: but perhaps the poignant pathos, the magical expression of despair, is too much lost in the overliteral translation. It is a hard matter to compete with Prof. Jebb in translation: but would it not be here better to aim at a terser and simpler paraphrase such as the following:—

> For where is the joy of day following day—
> now nearer—and now farther—when the
> end is death?

On 651, *βαφῇ σιδηρὸς ὥς, ἐθηλύνθην στόμα*, the editor supports the common interpretation 'like iron *hardened* in the dipping.' Readers of the *C.R.* will remember that the passage was discussed in a former number (Nov. 1890) by Mr. G. E. Marindin, who gave strong reasons for this interpretation. The solution of the scholiast, that hard iron was sometimes *softened* in an *oilbath*, (adopted by Mr. Whitelaw in his excellent translation) seems difficult to maintain in the face of the common use of *βαφή*, and the practical proof by the specialist, R. Paehler, that oil has *not* that effect. The objection to the common interpretation has always been the awkward dative *βαφῇ*, and the order of the words, which connects the simile better with *ἐθηλύνθην* than with *ἐκαρτέρουν*. These difficulties are forcibly urged by Mr. Whitelaw in reply to Mr. Marindin (*C.R.* Feb. 1891), and it must be confessed that Prof. Jebb has not completely removed them.

In noting the grammar points the editor is unfailing, and he often gives admirable and lucid explanations. Nothing could be better than his proof (against Goodwin) of the interrogative use of *οὐ μή* (75, appendix); it is only regrettable that his argument is confined to compound instances (of mixed commands and prohibitions), and is not extended to simple cases of interrogative *οὐ μή*. If you can say *οὐ μὴ προσοίσεις χεῖρα* (in the sense 'Won't you *not* bring your hand here?' i.e. *Don't*) when it is followed by *βακχεύσεις δ' ἰών*, then obviously you can (and the Greeks habitually do) use the same form alone. We wish Prof. Jebb would look a little further, and wholly reinstate the sound theory of Elmsley, which has latterly been struggling for existence against the great (and otherwise amply deserved) authority of Goodwin.

We have a good note on *τὸν μὲν ἥστο πλεῖστον ..χρόνον* (311): but we should like to see it clearly stated that the order is *Epic*, like *τὰ δ' ἐπῴχετο κῆλα θεοῖο*. [So *Agam.* 1056, *τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἑστίας μεσομφάλου ἔστηκεν ἤδη μῆλα...*] The two optatives, *χρεὼν...εἰ πάθοι* (521) *οὐ δίκαιον...εἰ θάνοι* (1344), are correctly explained and illustrated: but it is not sufficient to say that they 'mark the generality' of the statement, since the main point, the breach of *sequence*, is not adverted to. The editor should have quoted cases where such optatives follow verbs (expressed or understood) in *primary* tenses, as *O.T.* 979, *εἰκῇ κράτιστον ζῆν ὅπως δύναιτό τις;* and *O.T.* 315, *Antig.* 666. The well-known violation of usage, *ὁ λυμεὼν ἐμὸς* (573) is instructively noted: but there is an error in the reference to *Electra* 133, *τὸν ἐμὸν πατέρ' ἄθλιον*, which is simply a case of the 'Divided Attribute,' and is perfectly normal. On 1082, *ταύτην νόμιζε τὴν πόλιν...πεσεῖν*, Prof. Jebb adheres to his strange explanation of *πεσεῖν* as 'gnomic,' a usage necessarily, it seems to us, confined to the indicative. On the other hand, the aorist (and present) infinitive is normal in Greek after verbs of expectation, promise, and prophesy. Some instances are given by Prof. Jebb himself in the appendix to the *Electra* 442, to which he here refers; and there are several more, e.g. *Protag.* 316 C, *τοῦτο οἰεταί οἱ μάλιστα γενέσθαι εἰ σοὶ συγγένοιτο*, Eur. *Or.* 1527, *μῶρος εἰ δοκεῖς με τλῆναι*, Ar. *Vesp.* 177, *τὸν ὄνον ἐξάγειν δοκῶ*, *ib.* 159, *ὁ θεὸς.. ἔχρησεν...ἀποσκλῆναι τότε*, etc. The editor abandons this natural explanation, on the plea there is not sufficient 'help from the context'; but *χρόνῳ ποτὲ* is all that is needed to show that *νόμιζε ...πεσεῖν* refers to the future, and means 'expect it...to fall.'

One much disputed line (966) Prof. Jebb leaves standing, but explains in a way difficult to accept. We believe he is right to reject the emendations proposed, and still more the varied rearrangements sug-

gested. The line occurs in Tekmessa's last and most pathetic utterance. The context is 'Let them mock...one day they will long for him, in the stress of battle...unwise men know not the good till they have lost it': then comes abruptly:—

> ἐμοὶ πικρὸς τέθνηκεν ἢ κείνοις γλυκύς,
> αὐτῷ δὲ τερπνός.

The editor translates 'To my pain hath he died *more than* for their joy.' To understand μᾶλλον is surely impossible; and the common Homeric use of βούλομαι...ἤ gives no support to this view, as the verb of choice is there expressed. Why should not the abruptness be dramatic: 'Bitter to me his death, or sweet to them—but to himself 'tis joy.' She pauses, and the pause is eloquent: she dismisses alike her own grief, and his enemies' malignant triumph, in the thought that he has found peace. For the form, compare *Od.* iv. 409, οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν, ζώει ὅγ' ἢ τέθνηκε.

But enough. These criticisms are nearly all on small points which could be amended (or defended) in the next edition. Of the Sophocles as a whole we can only add our mite to the general verdict of scholars, who place it in the first rank of extant editions of the classics.

A. S.

VAN OORDT ON PLATO AND HIS TIMES.

Plato and the Times he Lived in. By J. W. G. Van Oordt. Oxford, 1895. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

Mr. Van Oordt has written a fresh and vigorous essay on a well-worn subject. He rightly holds that 'even in our days it may be of some use to study ancient Greece and her heroes in the field of politics and literature, especially in those parts of the world where another and better condition of affairs can still be brought about than that now witnessed in the old seats of European civilisation.' This sentence reminds us that the author is a member of the Cape of Good Hope University Council. His sketch is a tribute not only to the influence exercised by Plato's philosophy upon Christian thought, but also to Greece herself as the great civilising power of the world. The work is imbued with a warm sympathy for democratic Athens and the author is thoroughly acquainted with the public life of the time. By way of introduction he discusses the age of the poets, from Homer to Aristophanes, the wisdom of the great legislators and earliest philosophers, Solon, Thales, Pythagoras; next, what he calls the tragedy of Greek history, the rise and decline of the Athenian state from the reforms of Clisthenes to the ruin of the Sicilian expedition; then, more fully, the character and fate of Socrates, and the reasons why Aristophanes selected him as a representative of the tendencies which he considered subversive of moral and social order. Amongst the many bold and trenchant remarks in these introductory chapters are some novel suggestions which hardly commend themselves: *e.g.* p. 19 sqq. as to the reason for oligarchical intrigues before the battle of Tanagra. It seems hardly probable that, at a time when Athens itself garrisoned Megara (Thuc. 1. 103), any Athenian party can have foreseen the invasion of Attica in 445 B.C. or 431 B.C., or, again, that Pericles (p. 21) adopted the policy of interference in Boeotia and central Greece (457–447 B.C.) against his better judgment in order momentarily to pacify the opponents of the Long Walls. We should incline to believe that in 461 young Athens, with Pericles at its head, deliberately made a bid for the headship of Greece by land and sea, intending to bring Corinth and Aegina down to the level of Miletus and Rhodes. The attempt may have been virtually repeated thirty years later: but it is doubtful whether at that time Pericles could have averted the Peloponnesian war by concessions, as Mr. Evelyn Abbott seems to think.

There is another matter which calls for more serious consideration. Mr. Van Oordt speaks of the Platonic, *or rather Socratic*, ideas (the italics are our own). We cannot attribute so much intellectual ability to the historical Socrates as to endorse this phrase. That any one should have proposed such a solution of that standing problem, the difference between Socrates as seen by Plato and Socrates as seen by Xenophon, is startling at first sight, almost incredible; and, lest we should be charged with misrepresenting our author, we proceed to justify the asser-

tion made. Where he first offers this surmise (p. 39) it is with some diffidence. But the suggestion recurs (p. 113): 'the beginning of the *Parmenides* leaves no doubt that Socrates, although in Xenophon's Reminiscences not a word is said about ideas in the Platonic sense of the word, must have discussed the ideas with those of his friends whose brains fitted them for philosophical speculation.' Later on we are told that 'this doctrine' [that the human soul is immortal] 'was evidently as much one taught by Socrates to, and discussed with, such scholars of his as he thought fit for philosophical research as that of the ideas mentioned in the *Parmenides* and so many other Platonic dialogues' (p. 166). Again, on p. 255: 'to Socrates—the true Platonic Socrates, whom Xenophon never knew . . . Plato owes two leading doctrines of his philosophy, that of the ideas and that of learning being remembering, in other words that of an immortality of the individual soul on the basis laid' down 'by Pythagoras. Whether or not Socrates arrived at the conception of ideas by himself is not quite clear from the passage in the *Parmenides* (p. 130 B) where he is asked this question; and when in the *Phaedo* (p. 100 B), he states that, after having found no satisfaction in the doctrine of Anaxagoras, he had reverted to those things generally talked about (*πολυθρύλητα*) . . . it is evident that Plato does not consider the doctrine to have originated with him.' Neither the interpretation of *πολυθρύλητα* (see *Phaedo* 76 D, *ἃ θρυλοῦμεν ἀεί*) nor the inference in the last clause will pass unchallenged by the majority of Platonists who hold that the Platonic Socrates discussing the ideas is as much the mouthpiece of Plato as the Eleatic stranger or Timaeus. Before we abandon this well-grounded opinion we shall require to be convinced by cogent demonstration, which our author has made no pretence of producing.

The six chapters which form the main part of the essay contain a readable account of the principal dialogues, interspersed with critical remarks. The multitude of points raised and judgments passed renders a detailed review out of the question. The treatment of the *Sophist*, the *Gorgias* and the *Phaedrus* is perhaps the best. Generally the political dialogues are more congenial to our author than those on metaphysical subjects. He is inclined to regret the *Parmenides* as an early work: upon the object with which it was written he has no light to throw except that 'Plato having resolved to go into so abstruse a subject as ontology, may have been anxious to give beforehand an idea of the difficulties surrounding it.' Nor is it quite correct to say that the subject of the second part of the dialogue is 'the number one taken in the abstract.' When we come to the *Philebus* and the *Timaeus* the narrow limits of space are very trying and the treatment is obviously inadequate. The genuineness of the epistles is defended at Plato's expense. Some of the very peculiarities of style which are objected to are, it is asserted, to be found in the *Laws* and are natural characteristics of old age. The argument on which most stress is laid is that Plato's authorship alone adequately explains the shortcomings of these compositions. If not genuine, it is assumed that they must have been written by an admirer, well acquainted with Plato's writings and anxious to defend his conduct and character. But the impression left by them is one of vanity, diffuseness, pettishness—traits of old age—joined with a measure of fairmindedness and superiority to personal spite. 'Why,' it is asked, 'if written with an apologetic object, do they exactly reproduce what a highly estimable but pettish, vainglorious and not always judicious old man would have stated under the circumstances?' Thus with no small ingenuity one of their chief arguments is turned against the objectors themselves. Another novel suggestion is that the *First Alcibiades* and the *Menexenus* are after all genuine; but the reason why they are inferior compositions is that they were written in response to pressure from without. Suppose, *e.g.*, the criticism on Lysias to have prompted Plato's friends to demand of him, much against his will, an epideictic effort:—then the *Menexenus* would be explained.

There are other striking remarks with which we by no means concur, *e.g.* his exaggerated estimate of Alcibiades, the individualism of Aristippus; but enough has been said to indicate that in our opinion this is an acute piece of work which, in spite of a sometimes uncritical method, may serve as a popular introduction to the study of Plato.

R. D. Hicks.

THE GREEK PAPYRI OF VIENNA.

Corpus Papyrorum Raineri. Vol. I. Griechische Texte, herausgegeben von C. Wessely. Wien: 1895. Verlag der K.K. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei. Fl. 20.

For ten years, so the preface to this volume tells us, the preparations for the systematic publication of the great Rainer collection have been in progress. To the present writer, at least, this first product of so much labour seems rather disappointing. In the first place its contents are on the whole of decidedly second-rate importance. They are divided into two main parts, the first including the more or less complete documents, which range in date from the reign of Tiberius to that of Diocletian, and are grouped according to their subject-matter; the second, which is by far the larger, containing fragments of the same period which are related to the previous groups. This is no doubt a business-like and scientific arrangement. Except in the train of their better-preserved brethren, many of these somewhat sorry specimens could have had but a slender chance of ever displaying themselves to the world. Whether the world would have been much the poorer for the loss is another matter. The repetition of formulae, which, when duly restored, are often the only intelligible portion remaining, does not add much to our information. Anyhow, it can hardly be denied that the total result is a little dull. Even in the first part interest is with difficulty sustained. We are given two or three records of legal processes, which Dr. L. Mitteis has furnished with learned commentaries. These, with the texts on which they are based, probably form the most valuable part of the book, though it may be questioned whether a *Corpus* is quite the place for such exhaustive treatment. We have further a good series of marriage contracts, which are, however, not entirely new. The rest are sales, leases, agreements, and money transactions, of the type which the numerous recent publications both in this country and abroad have now rendered familiar, and with few special features that can attract the attention. There are doubtless better things to come; but this first course is scarcely calculated to whet the appetite.

Dr. Wessely has not seen fit to make any alteration in his methods. He eschews such refinements as the designation of doubtful letters no less than the addition of accents and breathings and the other ordinary aids to the reader. The exclusion of the latter may possibly be more strictly scientific; none the less it is, from any but the ultra-specialist point of view, extremely inconvenient. The phraseology of these documents is frequently obscure, and difficulties are not always removed by the accompanying translations and notes. But whichever way this question of method may be ultimately decided, a speedy decision of some kind is in the highest degree desirable. The literature of this class is increasing rapidly every year, both in bulk and importance. For students of several denominations, as has before now been remarked, it is the literature of the future. If so, the sooner editors can settle their differences and adopt a single rational system, the better it will be both for their public and for themselves.

The texts are not accompanied by facsimiles, a collection of which will be published later. For the present, therefore, Dr. Wessely's large experience must be accepted as a sufficient guarantee of the accuracy of the transcripts. Experience has however failed, as even a casual reader will observe, to ensure consistency in the marking of lacunae. In a note near the end of the book (p. 298), an attempt is made to explain the plan followed; but the explanation seems very inadequate. What is the relation between dots within and dots outside brackets? Does the number of dots represent the approximate number of lost letters? Do the brackets, dots, and blank spaces, which appear to be placed indiscriminately at the beginnings of obviously mutilated lines, correspond or not to actual differences in the originals? Surely in a professedly systematic publication of this class the possibility of such questions should have been precluded.

The issue of detailed indices, like that of facsimiles, has been deferred; their absence naturally detracts very considerably from the immediate value of the work. Print and paper are alike excellent; unfortunately this advantage has not been combined with that of cheapness. In the latter important particular, as in several others, the style of the Berlin 'Griechische Urkunden' has a distinct superiority.

H.

SOPHOCLES AND SHAKESPEARE.

Ars Tragica Sophoclea cum Shaksperiana Comparata. By Lionel Horton-Smith, Cambridge, Macmillan & Bowes, 1896. 6*s.* net.

Mr. Horton-Smith's Essay which has been printed 'by request' and published in a handsome form, deserves a wider audience than is commonly accorded to a Prize Exercise.

In clear and intelligible Latin he has put forth a series of observations which he has collected and arranged in a lucid order, while adding to them valuable reflections of his own. It is not his fault if the comparison of Shakespeare with Aeschylus, which might have yielded some striking results, comes only incidentally into his purview. The relation of ancient to modern tragedy is a fruitful subject which is by no means exhausted. Arising under conditions vastly different, in regions and in ages far apart, they are found to acknowledge common principles and to share a common spirit. Elizabethan tragedy shows this fact the more remarkably because it is not, like that of France and Italy, a direct imitation of the Greek. The link of connection, however, is perhaps more real externally than Mr. Horton-Smith is ready to admit. Shakespeare is closer to nature, and closer also to national feeling than his predecessors of the classical school, but he was content to borrow from them, and in following Marlowe he took over some elements which had classical prototypes. Take for example the 'Forensic Contest' which, as our author rightly says, has a subordinate place in Sophocles,—is there not more of this in Richard III. than in Shakespeare's later plays? Have we not also in that earlier style of his an alternation of ῥῆσις with στιχομυθία resembling the 'parallel verse' of a Greek play (Rich. III. i. 3. iv. 4)? But this external resemblance passes off and the essential nearness to nature and to the people remains.

There is at first sight some incongruity between the Latin text and notes, and the English headings, marginal summary and synopsis. Yet on second thoughts it appears that the author has used good judgment here. If he is to have more than a scholastic audience, as it is to be hoped he will, this inconsistency may contribute not a little to his success. The Latin dress which he wears as a primary condition of his task, is, however, in itself an advantage. For it gives the opportunity of—

"proprie communia dicere."

So much has been written both on Sophocles and Shakespeare, that many of Mr. Horton-Smith's observations if expressed in English might have appeared common-place. But those who peruse his essay, especially those to whom the subject is comparatively new, will find in it much that is striking and suggestive; and it will be unfair to him if his ample citation of authorities should be allowed to derogate from his originality. Much of what has been written on Sophocles especially is little read—still less acknowledged—and it was open to this Essayist had he so chosen to pose as the originator of many thoughts for which he has quoted parallels from previous writers. Paul Stapfer, for example, an acute critic both of ancient and modern tragedy, is little known in England.

Perhaps the topics on which Mr. Horton-Smith will be found most interesting are (1) the ancient chorus, with its effects, and its equivalents in the modern drama, (2) the contrasts of character, and (3) the use of 'tragic irony.' He has done well to place this last phrase between inverted commas. For the word irony in its application to the drama has undergone a curious change of meaning. That half-dissembled consciousness of superior knowledge which the Greeks understood by the term was attributed by learned commentators either to tragic Destiny, or to the poet as the interpreter of Destiny. But when the spectator is taken into the account, as is always necessary for the right interpretation of dramatic art, the thing meant is found to be more simply the pathetic contrast between appearance and reality, which the poet emphasizes through various modes of expression. As Mr. Horton-Smith rightly observes, this motive had larger scope in ancient than in modern tragedy, because the fable was more familiar to the audience. But it appears notwithstanding: for example, to revert once more to Shakespeare's earlier style, in *Richard II.* i. sc. 1, lines 116, 117, where Richard says of Bolingbroke—

"Were he my brother, *nay my kingdom's heir*,
As he is but my father's brother's son,"
&c.;

Or again, in a deeper manner, in Duncan's remark on Cawdor's treason, and where Hamlet says, in lines unfortunately corrupted, and too often 'cut' in the performance from the earliest times—

"So, oft it chances in particular men,
That for some vicious mole of nature in them," &c.

Hamlet, i sc. 4, ll. 23–38.

It is rather surprising that in speaking of anachronisms Mr. Horton-Smith should not have referred to Hector's quotation from Aristotle, and I think that something more might have been made of the essential analogy in point of dramatic construction between plays so widely disparate as the Oedipus Tyrannus and Macbeth; also the subtle changes of mood in the protagonists in Sophocles' dramas might have been profitably compared with the psychological evolution of great parts in Shakespeare. But this writer has broken ground effectively, as I have said, in a fruitful subject; and in treating of a theme which is very apt to lend itself to fantastic subtleties or to the pedantries of 'science falsely so called,' he has not overstepped the bounds of common-sense.

LEWIS CAMPBELL.

HARTMAN'S *EPISTOLA CRITICA*.

Epistola Critica ad amicos J. van Leeuwen et M. B. da Costa continens annotationes ad Odysseam. Scripsit J. J. HARTMAN. 8vo. 136, vi. pp. Lugd. Bat. A. W. Sijthoff, 1896. 3 M. 50.

THE above work is addressed by Prof. Hartman to the two well-known Leyden editors of Homer on the occasion of the appearance of the second and concluding volume of their edition of the *Iliad* (Ed. 2). It is presented as a congratulatory tribute on the conclusion of their task in accordance with a graceful custom in vogue among continental scholars, a custom either entirely unknown in England or, if recognised at all, certainly seldom honoured by observance. The scope of the book is indicated by the title. It is a series of notes and observations on the Odyssey, put together, we are informed, by the author while reading the commentary thereon previously published by his two friends. He begins by recognising in the most generous terms the merit and value of their achievement, and submits his own lucubrations to their consideration with many professions of modest deference. He hopes to find in them judges at once competent and friendly. He declares that he has in the main discussed passages, which they themselves have left without annotation. Sometimes he has supported conclusions they have reached, and occasionally he has dissented from their expressed opinions. The character and quality of his book may now occupy our attention. First of all I will refer with all possible brevity to a few of the emendations he suggests, which seem interesting and valuable :—

γ 27 *οὐ γὰρ ὀΐω | οὔ σε θεῶν ἀέκητι.* To avoid the unique double negative he proposes *ἦ γὰρ ὀΐω*, comparing A 78 *ἦ γὰρ ὀΐομαι.*

δ 639 *οὐ γὰρ ἔφαντο | ἐς Πύλον οἴχεσθαι.* Here H.'s *οὐδέ Ϝ' ἔφαντο* is evidently a better suggestion than L. and C.'s cacophonous *οὐ γὰρ ἔφαν τόν.*

ζ 245 *ἐνθάδε ναιετάων καί οἱ ἄδοι αὐτόθι μίμνειν.* There is ingenuity and sense in the proposed *ἐνθάδε ναιετάων ἠ ᾧ ἄδοι αὐτόθι μίμνειν*, 'either a dweller here or one who would be content here to abide,' *i.e.* a countryman or an alien. He aptly compares *ψ* 136, and would not object to retain *οἱ*, but considers it unnecessary that Odysseus should be definitely referred to. But after all in the earliest writing there would be little difference between *οἱ* and *ᾧ*.

ι 330 *ἦ ῥα κατὰ σπέος κέχυτο μεγάλ' ἤλιθα πολλή.* L. and C. propose *μυχόν* for the unsatisfactory *μεγάλ'*. H. suggests *διὰ σπέος μήλων κέχυτ'*, supporting the introduction of *μήλων* by ρ 297,

ἦ οἱ προπάροιθε θυράων
ἠμιόνων τε βοῶν τε ἅλις κέχυτ'.

κ 303 *καί μοι φύσιν αὐτοῦ ἔδειξε.* For *αὐτοῦ* he suggests *αὐτός* ad comitatem benigni dei significandam, an improvement certainly, but *φύσιν* is open to no less serious objection than *αὐτοῦ* itself, neither is *ἐκ γαίης ἐρύσας* at the beginning of the line easily to be reconciled with the preceding *τῇ, τόδε φάρμακον ἐσθλὸν ἔχων* (287). The whole line is almost

certainly an interpolation and may be removed without loss.

μ 71 *καί νύ κε καὶ τὴν κῦμα βάλε* is a bold alteration of *καί νύ κε τὴν ἔνθ' ὧκα βάλε* to supply a subject to *βάλε*. He compares L. and C.'s emendation of *χ* 456, *ταὶ δὲ ῥύπ' ἐκφόρεον, τίθεσαν δὲ θύραζε*, where a missing object, as here a subject, is neatly supplied.

π 181 *ἀλλοῖός μοι, ξεῖν', ἐφάνης νέον ἠὲ πάροιθεν*. That this, the traditional and current reading, is unsound seems hardly doubtful. Still the solution proposed by our author, *νέον ἠδὲ πάροιθεν*, modo et antea, is not very attractive; indeed *νέον* could very well dispense with the addition *ἠδὲ πάροιθεν* altogether. Perhaps *ἠέ περ ἐσσί* or *ἠέ περ ἦδη* is nearer the mark.

π 349 *ἐς δ' ἐρέτας ἁλιῆας ἀγείρομαι*. For *ἁλιῆας* he would write *ἐπιτηδές* from Λ 142. He accounts for the intrusion of *ἁλιῆας* very ingeniously as a necessary metrical expansion of *ἅλις*, a gloss on *ἐπιτηδές*.

ρ 515 *τρεῖς γὰρ δή μιν νύκτας ἔχον, τρία δ' ἤματ' ἔρυξα*. Here there is a fair, even a strong probability that his *ἐγώ* is right and *ἔχον* a mere corruption of the text. The superiority of *ἐγώ* is undeniable.

υ 106 *ἔνθ' ἄρα οἱ μύλαι ἧατο ποιμένι λαῶν*. Here he objects to the utter inappropriateness of *ἧατο* (*εἷατο*), proposing *ἦσαν*, which may indeed, for an obvious reason (v. *Class. Rev.* Febr. 1897), have been changed. The addition of *ϝέξ*, or as he prefers to write it *Ϝέξ*, is certainly ingenious and probably correct. He would read *ἔνθ' ἄρα Ϝέξ μύλαι ἦσαν ποιμένι λαῶν*. Perhaps *Ϝ' ἓξ* (*Ϝοι ἓξ*) would be preferable. A good deal might be said in favour of maintaining the pronoun here. The digamma in *ἕξ* is by no means beyond question.

φ 305. For *αἴ κε τὸ τόξον* he proposes the simple and convincing *αἴ κε σὺ τόξον*.

χ 184 *σάκος εὐρὺ γέρον*. He suspects, not unreasonably, the genuineness of *γέρον* and proposes to substitute *φέρον*, a change worth consideration.

ψ 52 *ἀλλ' ἔπε', ὄφρα σφῶιν εὐφροσύνης ἐπιβήῃ*
ἀμφοτέρων φίλον ἦτορ.

Here instead of Bekker's *ἐπιβήῃ*, which L. and C. have adopted, he proposes to read *ἐπιβήσω*, 'ut utriusque vestrum mentem ad laetitiam adducam.' The MSS. have *ἐπιβῆτον*, an intolerable form for *ἐπιβήετον*, which however generally maintains its ground in the texts accompanied by Nauck's correction, *σφῶι*. I cannot but think that Hartman's suggestion is in every way preferable to anything yet offered. *ἐπιβῆτον* is clearly due to the ancient critics, who believed that *σφῶιν* was the nominative, cf. Π. 99 (*Class. Rev.* Oct. 1896).

ω 348 *τὸν δὲ ποτὶ οἱ | εἶλεν*. He disposes satisfactorily of L. and C.'s defence of *εἶλεν* and restores *εἶλκεν* from Λ 239 *εἶλκ' ἐπὶ οἱ μεμαώς*.

Let us now turn our survey from the positive to the negative, from the constructive to the destructive criticism, wherewith he condemns emendations which have been made without sufficient warrant by other scholars. Here also we find matter of interest. In *β* 77 I am glad to see that he prefers the vulgate, *ἀπαιτίζοντες*, *ἕως*, bad as it is, to L. and C.'s *ἀπαιτίζονθ'*, *ἧος*, because he objects to Telemachus contemplating a prospective pilgrimage *in company with his mother* asking for restitution, a picture truly ultra-Euripidean in its pathos.

ζ 257. Here Herwerden's *ἔτι δηέμεν* is censured, though its ingenuity is justly praised; for, he urges, it is immaterial to Odysseus whether he finds the guests still present or not. If anything, he would probably prefer that they should be gone. He is sure to see them there later on, and it would be time enough to make their acquaintance then (*εἰδήσεται*, cognitos habebit).

θ 208. L. and C. have managed to eliminate *ἄν* from this line by reading:—

ξεῖνος γάρ μοι ὅδε· τίς κεν φιλέοντι μάχοιτο;

which is supposed to scan. Hartman considers the passage a bundle of incongruities, and so regards verbal alteration as wasted labour. However, as this is a view presumably not held by L. and C., there can be no harm in suggesting a more metrical line:—

ξεῖνος γάρ μοι ὅδ' ἐστι· τίς ἄρ κε φιλεῦντι
μάχοιτο;

μ 27. He defends the vulgate *ἢ ἁλὸς ἢ ἐπὶ γῆς* against Fick's *ἢ γαίης*.

ξ 122. *ὦ γέρον, οὔ τις κεῖνον ἀνὴρ ἀλαλημένος ἐλθών*
ἀγγέλλων πείσειε γυναῖκά τε καὶ φίλον υἱόν.

He rejects L. and C.'s *εἴ τις* for *οὔ τις*, which would convert the sentence into a wish, and proposes himself *οὔ κεν κεῖνον*. Perhaps *οὔ τίς κεν τὸν ἀνήρ* would account more easily for the vulgate.

ξ 287. L. and C.'s ἀλλ' ὅτε δή μοι ἐπιπλόμενον ἔτος ὄγδοον ἦλθε is certainly not a desirable transposition. Ordo vix Homericus videtur, says Hartman.

ξ 495. This line, assailed by Aristarchus, Cobet and others, he defends vigorously. He denies that λίην γάρ (496) can properly begin a speech without a vocative preceding as at κ 190. Similarly he demurs at 381-2 to beginning a speech with ἀλλ' ἄγε, as Friedländer's removal of 381-2 would necessitate.

π 423. He condemns L. and C.'s ἀλλοδαποῖσι for ἀλλήλοισι, and most readers will agree with him.

On the other hand he freely bestows approval on conjectures which he considers meritorious, as Cobet's ἔμιμνε δ 733, Nauck's εἴ ποσέ σοι κ 66, Naber's ἔφυσαν κ 393 with removal of 394, Herwerden's ἐνῆκε ο 198 for ἐνήσει.

ω 198. He accepts with both hands, ambabus manibus, ἐχέφρονα Πηνελόπειαν from Bothe and Bekker, and rightly scouts the idea of the gods composing a poem for mankind as a reward to Penelope for good conduct, as the vulgate would have us believe.

Perhaps it is in the rejection of supposed interpolations or corruptions that most difficulty will be felt in accepting Prof. Hartman's views; yet even when he fails to convince, as is often the case, the line of argument he pursues is generally deserving of careful consideration.

He condemns δ 739-41, λ 274-5, ο 299-300, 373, ρ 533, passages where it is difficult to refuse assent to his criticism. He is less successful, I think, in attacking α 205, δ 684, where the knot should be untied, not cut.

ο 227 ἀφνειὸς Πυλίοισι μέγ' ἔξοχα δώματα ναίων.

He is mistaken in supposing μέγ' ἔξοχα open to objection (ineptum). Not only is the use of μέγα with adjectives, positive, comparative, and superlative, quite Homeric, but this identical combination is to be found B 480, φ 266, surely a sufficient warrant. Again to adopt μετ', a variant of μέγ', because it spoils the line, is really too cruel by half. Why not read by a slight change ἀφνεὶ' ἐν Πυλίοισι? The application of ἀφνειός to a house may be found α 232, 393, ρ 420. Still it is so much more frequently applied to a person, that the appearance of the nom. here, though entailing the loss of ἐν, is not surprising.

ν 42 ἀμύμονα δ' οἴκοι ἄκοιτιν—εὕροιμι. He suspects ἀμύμονα, desiderating ἀπήμονα or the like. But the epithet is not necessarily a part of the predication, which is complete without it.

τ 45. He naturally asks what is the force of ἐρεθίζω here. That Odysseus should wish to 'provoke' his wife and servants is little less than an absurdity. Perhaps the true reading was ἀλεγύνω, or nearer to the tradition ἀλεγίζω. The latter may have been altered from the idea that the genitive should follow, as is usual.

Reasonable exception is also taken to the following: τ 68 δαιτὸς ἔνησο, υ 304 θυμῷ, φ 260 ἅπαντας, 291 καὶ ῥήσιος. χ 380 is rejected as spurious, because the safety of the individuals is already assured. In χ 499 καὶ κύνεον ἀγαπαζόμενοι. L. and C. read καὶ κύνεόν Ϝ' ἀγαπαζόμενοι. Hartman objects to the pronoun coming in at all. The real objection is to its position. We might read καί Ϝε κύνεον which can be scanned with a synizesis of -εον.

ψ 175 οὔτε λίην ἄγαμαι is deservedly misdoubted. Quomodo et quo sensu annectatur praecedentibus pervelim me doceatis, he says, and will probably appeal in vain. Meanwhile ἀλλά may be suggested for οὔτε as a slight improvement, 'But I marvel much,' 'greatly do I wonder,' cf. ζ 168.

Many of the objections however seem scarcely tenable. In μ 52 τερπόμενος may fairly be defended in spite of the discomfort suffered from the bonds. It is scarcely credible that any interpolator meant it to be equivalent to χαίρων 'with impunity.' It is far simpler and indeed quite satisfactory to understand that Odyssey snatches a joy even at the cost of some corporal pain. In π 244 it is surely hypercritical to object to the suitors being called ἴφθιμοι, to say nothing of the fact that the epithet is applied more than half a dozen times to women, Penelope, &c. υ 14 and χ 7 are also instances in which one can hardly subscribe to the opinions expressed. Still upon the whole we have here a body of criticism by no means unworthy of the famous Leyden University, and as productions of this kind and quality are rare in England, I need make no apology for calling attention even at some length to Professor Hartman's meritorious work.

T. L. Agar.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

HITZIG AND BLUEMNER'S EDITION OF PAUSANIAS.

Pausaniae Graeciae Descriptio, edidit, Graeca emendavit, apparatum criticum adjecit Hermannus Hitzig, commentarium Germanice scriptum cum tabulis topographicis et numismaticis addiderunt Hermannus Hitzig et Hugo Bluemner. Voluminis prioris pars prior. Liber primus; Attica. Berolini, 1896, apud S. Calvary & Co. 18 Mk.

A new critical and exegetical edition of Pausanias has long been among the chief desiderata in an archaeological library. Though the Ἑλλάδος περιήγησις—a title, by the way, which is conspicuously absent from the new edition—is perhaps more often quoted and referred to by archaeologists than any other classical work, there has been no annotated edition since that of Siebelis, in 1822–28; while the critical edition of Schubart and Walz (1838–9) hardly fulfills modern requirements. More than one attempt is being made to meet the need; the first to appear is the edition now before us, which, however, at present contains only the first book, the more important parts of which are also included in Mrs. Verrall and Miss Harrison's *Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens*.

The *apparatus criticus* is about twice as extensive as that in Schubart and Walz. The additional matter is partly due to a new collation of the more important MSS., especially those in Paris, which had only been consulted occasionally or at second hand by the earlier editors; partly to the mass of conjectural emendations that have been made since 1838. The text, however, is but little altered; hardly any conjectures have been admitted into it, though so many are recorded, and though the editor acknowledges the state of the tradition to be such that there is ample scope both for choice between recorded readings and for guesses at their original. The additions to the *apparatus* are mainly valuable for the help they give in estimating the value of the various MSS. and their relation to one another: in many difficult places one would have been glad to have had a more definite statement of opinion from an editor who has made so careful a study of his author's peculiarities; for, in the case of Pausanias, it is peculiarly necessary to have a minute acquaintance with the author's language and mannerisms in order to choose between different readings and conjectures.

In the commentary also the tendency is on the whole conservative, as is fitting in a work dedicated to Ernst Curtius. Yet the newest theories appear to be all stated with clearness and impartiality, even when the editors do not adopt them, or express their dissent from then. Indeed, the fulness with which all suggestions are enumerated perhaps amounts to a fault: any suggestion by an authority like Dörpfeld or Lolling is worth recording, because it is based on thorough knowledge of the sites, and may be suggestive even if afterwards withdrawn by its author; but there are many guesses by less competent writers of which it is difficult to see the use. In most cases of difficulty—and they abound in this book—the editors content themselves with an enumeration of the various views that have been proposed; and such an enumeration is most bewildering without a summary and expression of opinion to conclude it, especially when authorities of very different weight are quoted side by side. Judging by this commentary alone, one would again and again be disposed to despair of any conclusion, with a 'who shall decide when doctors disagree?' Only occasionally the editors venture on a decided opinion; thus they express their scepticism as to the placing of the Enneacrunus south-west of the Areopagus, an opinion of which Dörpfeld is now the chief advocate. Yet in dealing with the whole Enneacrunus episode, of which this is the crucial point, they content themselves with mentioning the various theories that have been held. In so complicated a matter, an editor is justified in reserving his judgment; but one may expect from him at least a judicial summing up, if not a definite verdict. Here we are left to unravel the evidence and the speeches of the various counsel for ourselves. We should have been very glad to hear how an editor familiar with the idiosyncrasies of Pausanias would explain this curious deviation from the natural order of description. Again, of the plans at the end of the book, no less than five are restorations of the Agora, to show the route of Pausanias; these restorations, being by different authorities, differ very widely from one another,

yet there is no special comment on them and no criticism; nor do the editors venture on any restoration or route of their own. The result is more confusing than if there were no plans at all. It may be said that it is not the duty of an editor of Pausanias to write a treatise on the topography of Athens; but unless he has a clear notion of the topography in his mind, his notes can hardly fail to be confusing; and that is just what has happened in the present instance.

It follows from what has already been said that there is but little scope for criticism of details. The compilation is evidently so careful and thorough as not to leave any serious gaps. The text, as we have seen, has little that is new; but a few changes are worth noticing. In 19, 1 Dindorf's emendation *παρῆγε τὸν ὄροφον* is certainly right, in view of *Pollux*, x. 170, showing that *ὄροφος* means rush thatching; but why is the order changed to *τὸν ὄροφον παρῆγε*? All the MSS. have *παρῆν τὸν ὄροφον*. In 29, 2 the 'Epics of Sappho' rightly disappear; there can be no doubt, on referring to viii. 35, 8, that Pausanias wrote Πάμφω. But in 29, 7 the repetition of *ἐτάφησαν* and the full stop are quite needless '*τῶν ἐπ' Ὀλυνθον ἐλθόντων οἱ δοκιμώτατοι . . . ., ἐτάφησαν δὲ καὶ οἱ τελεύσαντες πολεμοῦντες Κασσάνδρου κ.τ.λ.*' is a perfectly clear construction. Another passage, which has long been a difficulty, has met at last with a successful remedy by the insertion of *ὅδον—τὴν δὲ ὀνομαζομένην ἀπὸ Σκίρωνος καὶ ἐς τόδε ὅδον Σκίρων, ἡνίκα Μεγαρεῦσιν ἐπολεμάρχει, . . . ἐποίησεν*. The MSS. give the form *Σκιρώνην*, of which the origin is obvious; and many previous editors have been misled by it, or have suspected a lacuna or a serious error.

To pass to the commentary, it surely shows a curious ignorance of modern research to pass over *Λύκος* and *Λυκεῖον* with the explanation that Lykos means light-bringer, and that the Greek connexion with *Λύκος*, wolf, is a mere error; it seems strange perversity in a case like this, when Aegeus appears in the next sentence, and is simply dismissed as 'darkness or winter.' Indeed, mythological matters are very generally neglected or treated from an antiquated standpoint. Even so interesting a question as the Buphonia 28, 11, receives no discussion whatever. The subject of the Panathenaic ship is always a most confusing one, and little is here found to remedy the confusion, which arises in great part from an application to the festival in earlier times of a particular and probably novel invention of Herodes Atticus, described by Philostratus (*Vit. Soph.* ii. 1, 5). He made an elaborate structure resembling a ship, and drawn by hidden machinery, to take the place of the earlier car, on which was erected the pole carrying the peplos which suggested the comparison of a sail. This machine of Herodes may not have been set up in Athens until after Pausanias' visit; he inserts it at the very end of his description of the sights in the city of Athens; and it may well have been left at first near the Areopagus, and later transferred to the place near the Pythion where Philostratus saw it, and where it would be near to the monument of Herodes; it was probably taken round the city with the procession every four years. If Pausanias and Philostratus are both right, the only alternative is to suppose that the Pythion here means the cave of Apollo, which is usually known as the sanctuary of Apollo *ὑπακραῖος*. This expedient is adopted by the editors, though they reject elsewhere Dörpfeld's theory that Thucydides refers to this Pythion in the famous passage ii. 15. The editors have no hesitation in saying that Thucydides must refer here to the great Pythion near the Ilissus—or Ilisus as it is now written—and there is no other satisfactory evidence for a confusion.

The fulness of this edition in reference to all that has been published, especially in Germany, will make it a most valuable acquisition to all students of the topography of Athens; and if we do not always find in it much help towards the solution of our difficulties, we at least find an abundant record of the way in which they have hitherto been dealt with. It is but a tribute to the competence of the editors, to say that we should like to know their own opinion as to many questions on which they only tell us the theories of their predecessors.

ERNEST GARDNER.

BORNECQUE'S EDITION OF CICERO *DE SIGNIS*.

M. Tullii Ciceronis Oratio in Verrem de Signis, publiée avec une Introduction et un Commentaire explicatif. Par HENRI BORNECQUE. Paris, 1896. Price 1f. 50c.

THIS is a charming little edition, printed in good type on good paper, with convenient

footnotes on points of grammar or history and an excellent introduction, all for the modest sum of 1*s.* 3*d.* A scholarly analysis of the speech and discussion of its circumstances and political significance are followed by some excellent sections on Roman criticism and appreciation, on the works of art mentioned in the speech, on Verres as connoisseur and collector, and on Cicero as art-critic. That in an introduction of 44 pages to a school-book, 30 should be devoted to the discussion of artistic matter, shews how surely in France, as in Germany, archaeology is gaining ground as a school subject.

It may be questioned, however, whether in writing for young students M. Bornecque is wise in bringing forward certain recent, entirely unproved identifications of ancient statues. It seems out of place in a book of this kind to state, even on the high authority of Furtwängler, that so unattractive an object as a certain, now headless, herm once had a head displaying the features of the Myronian Apollo, or to mention the Albani bust as the copy of the Sappho of Seilanion. Although the latter identification receives apparently M. Collignon's full approval (*Hist. de la Sculpt. Grecque*, ii. p. 345) it rests on a misunderstanding of the evolution of the type represented by the bust (see Furtwängler, *Masterpieces of Gr. Sc.* p. 66 ff. where the head is more correctly interpreted as an Aphrodite). On the other hand it is surprising that M. Bornecque in discussing the *simulacrum Aristaei* of § 128, omits to connect the type of Aristaios with the beautiful bronze statuette in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Babelon et Blanchet, *Cat. des Bronzes Antiques. de la Bibl. Nat.* p. 264, No. 623; Furtwängler, *Meisterwerke d. Gr. Pl.* p. 490, Pl. XXXVIII. = Engl. ed. p. 276, Fig. 116; cf. E. Michon in *Monuments et Mémoires*, fond. Piot. vol. iii. p. 64).

The foot-notes are fully adequate to the purpose of the book: we get more grammar than in the small school edition of Thomas (Paris, 1886), and besides much that is due to his own research the author gives us the best out of Thomas' larger edition. In two or three small points, however, the earlier editor is followed to disadvantage. The statement on p. 49, note 1, that in the phrase...*Thespiadas quae ad aedem Felicitatis sunt* of § 4, *ad* is equivalent to *in* ('dans') re-opens a vexed question. These 'Thespiades,' which are usually assigned to Praxiteles, are mentioned in identical phrase by Pliny *N.H.* xxxvi., 39 (*Thespiades ad aedem Felicitatis*). The Praxitelean statues mentioned in xxxiv., 69 as being *ante aedem Felicitatis* throw no further light on the subject; for these works were of bronze while the Thespiades were of marble; attempts at identification are futile since the Romans, precisely like the moderns, constantly brought together into one place several works by the same artist. At the same time it would appear that *ad* in the Plinian passage first quoted is practically equivalent to *ante;* Pliny seems careful to use *in* when he means *inside*, *ante* when he means exactly in front, while *ad* he uses more loosely when he merely means outside the temple, *i.e.* within its precinct in some adjacent space or portico (cf. *ad aedem Fortunae Huiusce Diei* in *N.H.* xxxiv., 54). Of the four Ciceronian instances, quoted by Thomas, by Bornecque and by Bornecque's chief grammatical authority Riemann, three need mean no more than is implied by our English 'at'; the place where without necessary implication of 'inside'; they occur with the word *villa* (*Verr.* iv. § 36; *pro Rosc. Amer.* § 44; *pro M. Tullio*, § 20); the fourth instance *utinam ad Opis maneret!* (*Phil.* i., 7) comes nearer to requiring the absolute sense of *in*. Still another ambiguous example is the *ad aedem Honoris et Virtutis* of Verr. iv. § 121. The point has already been touched upon by Mr. J. S. Reid in his notice (*Class. Rev.* ii., 1888, p. 210b) of Thomas' larger edition of the same speech; it would be a real boon to students of archaeology, if some philologist would definitely clear it up.[1] On p. 53 n. 11 it is repeated from Thomas that the word *ereptio* in § 10 is in all Latin only to be found in this passage. What about the *in animae ereptione* of Tertullian?—a phrase, by the way which Lewis and Short erroneously quote as from the *de Spectaculis*; it occurs in the *de Idolatria* 2.—One might perhaps expect a note on the *fingere e cera* of § 30. Still all these are trivial points in a school edition which should be welcomed as a delightful guide to a Ciceronian speech which owing to its humour, to its gaiety, to the concreteness of the matter touched upon is exceedingly attractive to young students.

EUGÉNIE SELLERS.

MUNICH.

[1] An attempt to answer this question is made on page 111 of this number.—G. E. M.

SCHNEIDER'S *DAS ALTE ROM.*

Das Alte Rom. Entwickelung seines Grundrisses u. Geschichte seiner Bauten auf 12 Karten u. 14 Tafeln dargestellt mit e. Plane d. heutigen Stadt sowie e. stadtgeschichtlichen Einleitung, herausgegeben von Arthur Schneider. Folio, Pp. xii., 14 Plates with over 2600 Illustrations, 12 Maps on tracing paper and 1 Map on card. Leipzig: Teubner, 1896. 16 Mk.

This is a work which only needs to be used to become indispensable to all who have an interest in the topography of Rome. It is an adequate pictorial summary of nearly all that is known of the ancient city, compressed into the smallest possible limits.

The most original feature in the book is a series of maps on tracing paper. By inserting the accompanying plan of modern Rome beneath one of these the ruins of any of twelve selected periods are shown distinctly in their correct position. Besides this the paper is transparent enough to allow two or three maps to be taken together, thus showing the change from one period to another. The periods chosen start with the Roma Quadrata of prehistoric times and end with the third and fourth centuries A.D.

The plates also deserve much praise. They are large enough to allow an average of over 20 illustrations to the page and not only give photographs of the existing remains, with detailed ground plans, but add illustrations from sculptures, coins, old sketch books and reconstructions by good authorities. The resources of a large library and a fine collection of photographs are thus placed at the service of all who can afford the modest sum of sixteen shillings. As a rule the reproductions of the photographs, the weak point in most books of the kind, are distinctly good and the plans and restorations are on a sufficiently large scale to be clear, a rare merit. A happy idea of the editor's has been to insert near some of the ancient plans sections from modern maps of Berlin, Vienna, Leipzig or Munich of the same size, to give those familiar with these towns a conception of the comparative size of public places at Rome. Trafalgar Square and its surroundings compared with the Forum, Olympia with the Colisseum would be English equivalents.

The only criticism that suggests itself is that in some of the plates illustrations which have but little to do with Rome are introduced. This is especially the case with the Etruscan and Alban antiquities of the earlier plates, and the Pompeian houses of the latter. These additions however serve the purpose of putting the Roman remains in a better historical perspective and as such justify their presence from a practical teacher's point of view.

As an aid to teaching, the Atlas suffers from its size of page. It would be difficult to show most of the illustrations to more than one student at a time and it is too large to be handed round.

Its value would be much increased by an index, for it requires a certain familiarity with the dates and correct names of the buildings to discover them easily.

Doctor Schneider's introduction is a general sketch of the changes in the outward appearance of Rome. He gives no detailed description of the illustrations, but leaves readers to consult standard works, with titles and references to the source of the illustration to guide them.

His intention is to provide material for first hand study, to supplement and not to supplant the works of Lanciani, Hulsen and others. With his aid Murray and Baedeker can be read with interest at home and perhaps even used for class teaching.

Finally, we have nothing but praise for the ingenuity and industry shown in the accumulation and selection of illustrations and trust that the work will be soon on the table of every school and college library.

W. C. F. Anderson.

MARRIOTT ON THE MASONS' MARKS IN POMPEI.

Facts about Pompei; Its Masons' Marks, Town Walls, Houses and Portraits; with a complete list of the Masons' Marks cut in the stones, by H. P. Fitz-Gerald Marriott, 4to. Pp. 89, with 11 Plates, 1 Plan and 6 illustrations. London: Hazell, Watson and Viney. No date (1895 ?).

In this sumptuously printed work we have a curious medley of descriptions, impressions and original observations. The author is not a professed archaeologist but he has diligently collected the Masons' Marks throughout the town. They fill twelve pages (pp. 63 to 85 with alternate blank leaves) of his monograph, and are accompanied by notes of the locality. Mr. Fitzgerald

Marriott has, perhaps wisely, abstained from either criticising, classifying or giving references to them, so that they remain as raw materials for future work. A detailed list of the towers in the walls is also given with a sketch showing the structure of one of them, but not much new information. The rest of the work is occupied with an abstract of Mau's work on the 'Four styles of Mural Decoration,' and notes on lately discovered houses. This part is intended to supplement the old guide-books and is of interest in many ways. The account of the 'cliff-houses' will be useful to those who have not had the opportunity of visiting them. The remainder of the monograph is of no special value except to the tourist. The plates are photo-lithographic and for the most part have been printed so heavily that all gradations in tone are blocked up. Five of them are originals, the rest reproductions of well-known photographs, including the Hermes from Herculaneum.

The book has, we suspect, been published by subscription and probably its defects are due to the desire to please a mixed circle of friends. It seems a pity that the author's advisers were not more discreet. He has done good work in the matter of direct, original observation but as yet does not appear to have reached results sufficient to justify such an ambitious publication. One may expect better work from him in the future.

W. C. F. Anderson.

GASTON BOISSIER'S *L'AFRIQUE ROMAINE*.

Gaston Boissier. *L'Afrique Romaine; Promenades archéologiques en Algerie et en Tunisie.* 12mo. Pp. 325, with 4 Plans. Paris: Hachette, 1895. 3 fr. 50 c.

The interest in M. Boissier's latest work is somewhat different from that in his familiar musings on classic sites in Italy. His theme is not so hackneyed, and the monuments and ruins he saw are scarcely known to the world at large. Yet he has no Horace and Virgil to read by the way and inspire his meditations. He even dismisses the thought of giving more than a hint of the manner in which Virgil composed the fourth Aeneid. He prefers to seek inspiration from patriotic visions of the future, and throughout seeks parallels in the history of French conquest for the incidents of the Roman campaigns. The triumph of Rome and the prosperity of the Province under the Emperors are to him but a forecast of what may be achieved by enlightened French Government.

The book begins with an examination of the various races that inhabit Algeria and Tunis. The author holds that the Berber race, which he takes to include both the dark and fair types, is truly indigenous, descended from the aborigines of pre-historic times. Though conquered and civilised by Carthaginian, Roman, Byzantine and Arab they have retained their language and now remain much as they were when the Roman first entered the country. This is the keynote of the work, which ends as it begins with a reference to the mission of France to bring the Berbers back once more to civilisation. A sketch of the successive conquests of North Africa is given, followed by an account of the Roman methods of administration and of the remains of Roman villas and towns. An interesting description of the excavations at Timgad serves as an object lesson to show the far reaching results of Roman rule. This is further illustrated by a study and appreciation of Apuleius and Dracontius. Then the book closes with an investigation of the reason why the Roman spirit was never thoroughly assimilated; the explanation being the continuity of the Berber nationality, which remained and still remains unchanged.

To those who have learned to know M. Boissier from his earlier works there is no need to recommend his last. They will find in it that his style has lost nothing of its simple elegance, and that his many sided genial scholarship can make even the dry details of archaeological and anthropological research interesting.

W. C. F. Anderson.

TRANSLATION OF GASTON BOISSIER'S *NOUVELLES PROMENADES*.

The Country of Horace and Virgil. By Gaston Boissier, Translated by D. Havelock Fisher. Pp. xi. + 346, with Maps and Plans. 8vo. London: Fisher Unwin. 1896. 7*s.* 6*d.*

The *Nouvelles promenades archéologiques, Horace et Virgile*, has reached a third edition. It is a *causerie*, a delightful series of reflections and impressions recorded after

a visit to Rome. M. Boissier visits the site of Horace's farm, Horace in hand, and meditates on Maecenas and his circle, life in Rome and the character of the poet. He explores the tombs at Corneto, moralises on *malaria* and its effects and attempts to give an estimate of the Etruscan view of life as shown by the wall-paintings and furniture of the sepulchral chambers. An excursion to Trapani, Eryx, and Segesta suggests a discussion of the fifth book of the Aeneid, the worship of Venus, Theocritus, Bucolic poetry &c. A walk from Ostia to Pratica (*Lavinium*) and a ramble in search of Laurentum naturally lead to an appreciation of the last six books of the Aeneid. Surely nothing can be worse chosen than the English title. It emphasises the least important part of the book, the topographical; and is inadequate, for at least three fourths of the matter have nothing to do with the country.

The title page is misleading in another respect. It says 'with maps and plans' but there are only two maps and no plans. As for the translation the best that can be said is that it is readable but shockingly inaccurate. Either the translator knows no Latin, and no Greek, or else he never corrects proofs and allows full play to the conjectural emendations of the British printer. The misprints are so frequent and appalling that we should recommend the publisher to issue a list of errata with all copies, or else, for his own credit, to recall the edition.

The following examples will suffice; Plancus becomes Plaucus (pp. 21, 23), or Planeus (p. 56), Marcellus masquerades as Marullus (p. 51, twice); we have Thassus (= Thapsus (p. 210), Maegara (= Megara p. 210), Lucian (= Lucan, p. 166), Gaulon and Squalan (= Caulon and Scylaceum p. 202), Juno Sacinia (= Lacinia p. 202), Pythagorus (p. 202), Xanthe (= Xanthus, p. 90), Albanian (= Albunean, p. 333), Pachinum (= Pachynum, p. 212), Marsci (= Marsi p. 244), Lucretalis (= Lucretilis, p. 4), Cumea (= Cumae, p. 146). Besides these we find a large number of bastard forms, such as Aulu-Gelle, Denys of Halicarnassus, Pollion, Eolo-Dorian, Segestes, Selinonte, Pessinonte, Valerino Maximus. Even modern names are incorrect; 'Vulei' for Vulci occurs three times (pp. 70, 90, 105), Coere for Caere also three times (pp. 91, 109, 111), we have too 'Scalager' (p. 209), Pentinger (= Peutinger, p. 4). Sometimes there are misprints in the English, *e.g.* 'orational' (= national, p. 151), 'mused' (= nursed, p. 175), everywhere there is a mixture of modern Italian place-names with classical, *e.g.* Baia, Grecia Magna, occasionally there are downright mistakes, as 514 B.C. (p. 144) for A.U.C. and there are numerous misprints in the Latin quotations. Taken altogether it would be difficult to find a more unscholarly or 'corrupt' text. We are heartily sorry for M. Boissier.

W. C. F. Anderson.

TORR'S *MYCENAE AND MEMPHIS.*

In the vain hope of avoiding controversy of this kind, I gave Mr. Torr the opportunity of seeing my review of his book in proof. After receiving a lengthy rejoinder, and working over the whole ground again, I altered or omitted everything of which I felt that he had reasonable ground to complain. But Mr. Torr has since commented upon other passages also in my review; and by sentences selected from the review itself and from articles cited therein has attempted to make me say a number of very foolish things. Most of them I did not in effect say: the remainder I am prepared to stand by until he has refuted them.

I have however to apologise for two wrong references which Mr. Torr has corrected; and for two other misprints which he has set down to me as archaeological blunders.

His method of refutation may be estimated from a few examples in which my reply can be brief.

On the Tellel-Amarna question, he repeats his former representation of the evidence, omitting, as before, the vital fact that the Aegean potsherds were found, *not* separately, but throughout a very large mass of XVIIIth Dynasty potsherds, in such a way that subsequent admixture is out of the question. This fact disposes of both the questions which he propounds. The Aegean pottery *is* of XVIIIth Dynasty date, because it cannot have been put where it was found at any subsequent date.

On the Kahun question, Mr. Torr quotes only half of Prof. Petrie's statement, and then accuses me of misrepresenting him. The passage to which I referred is quoted in Mr. Torr's own review of Prof. Petrie's book. Prof. Petrie's 'internal evidence contradicting a late date' is as follows, in the passage to which I referred:—

'None were finer or thinner than [the fragments published *Illahun*, Pl. i. 12, 14: *J. H. S.* xi. Pl. xiv.

5]. Now these belong to a class of vessel which is wholly unknown to myself or to other students to whom I have referred, as ever having been found in historic pottery. The mouth is a simple hole without a lip, like a hole cut in a gourd.'

This is the form which Mr. Torr cannot distinguish from the Greek *stamnos* which has a distinct neck.

Throughout these paragraphs Mr. Torr has confused my summary of Prof. Petrie's argument with my own independent observations. I only quoted Prof. Petrie's authority for statements which he *has* made.

On the Cretan origin of the pottery in question, Mr. Torr ingeniously rearranges his quotation. The sentences, from 'The general character . . .' onwards, begin a fresh paragraph in my paper, and summarise three pages of evidence, of which the sentences immediately preceding are one subsidiary item.

His extract from my p. 356, still less represents my statement. I italicise the words which have been omitted :—

'The correspondence between Prof. Petrie's lithographs and my own may not be very striking, *but I was fortunately able to travel direct from Heráklio to London, and so to see the two series of fragments within the same ten days, and* I can only repeat that the two wares are almost identical.'

In the next paragraph Mr. Torr confronts me with Mr. Evans' account of the Dibáki find. His statement that Mr. Evans' book has no appendix is a verbal quibble. The book consists of a paper reprinted from the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, to which is *appended* the short paper which I cited. I cited it not 'in proof' of my statement (which is based on my own independent enquiries in Crete before Mr. Evans went there or Prof. Halbherr returned there), but as the only published account of the deposit besides that of Dr. Mariani to which I had already referred. I may of course have been misled by my informant; but even Mr. Evans' very cautious statement leaves it clear (1) that the deposit consisted of human bones associated with pottery and jewellery (2) that the evidence existed for assigning them to a XIIth Dynasty date, in the shape of XIIth Dynasty scarabs, and of native imitations of these (and of no other) Egyptian fabrics.

Again, on the recognition of XVIIIth and XIXth Dynasty fabrics among the porcelain objects on Mykenaean sites, I quoted *J. H. S.* xii. p. 273 ff. (which should be p. 199 ff.) not as a *complete* statement, but as the best published discussion of the question. I am prepared to abide by the statement both as to XVIIIth and as to XIXth Dynasty fabrics until Mr. Torr can prove to me a single contradictory instance.

On the origin of Queen Thii, my criticism was that Mr. Torr had committed either a logical fallacy or a grammatical confusion. His retort is to print my sentence halved, and adorned with italics of his own.

He gives as a last 'sample' of my archaeological work a passage where I *wrote* 'VIIIth century' (in *numerals*) and overlooked the printer's error 'VIIth century.' Mr. Torr quotes this as 'seventh century' in *words* (a less probable misprint), and adds the passage from the *Times* article in which the year 700 is mentioned. A more candid critic would have added that the whole tenour of the *Times* article is to attribute the Mykenaean necropolis at Kurion to a date below 700 : and that 700 is the highest date specifically mentioned. Further, the statement in question has been frequently made to me lately by archaeologists of repute, whose names, for their own sakes, ἐκὼν λήθομαι. As before, I quoted the *Times* article as the best published version of the theory, for comparison with my own statement.

On the chronological question I thank Mr. Torr for the reference to Biot, which I had overlooked. With regard to Mahler's dating and the remainder of this section of the rejoinder I remain quite unconvinced. The fact that 'the Greeks always spoke of the Egyptian kings by the *nomen*' does not prove that the 'era of Menophres' was not known by the praenomen Men-peh-Ra to the *Egyptian* authorities from whom the Greeks knew it.

All that is claimed for 'dead-reckoning from the lists' is that it represents Egyptian tradition supplemented by certain collateral evidence : Mr. Torr's reckoning represents other collateral evidence supplemented by Egyptian tradition. The two disagree, but the former agrees more nearly than the latter with a set of astronomical data which many Egyptologists believe to be mainly trustworthy. On this ground the balance of probability is against Mr. Torr's reckoning, especially as Mr. Torr's dates are admittedly *minima*, whereas the dates from 'dead-reckoning' are by no means *maxima*.

Mr. Torr repudiates the genealogical part of his book ; but when a writer fills page after page with statements that A, father of B, married C, daughter of D, and so forth, a reviewer may be pardoned if he thinks that a genealogy is intended. If he finds these statements, together with a

number of conjectural identifications of persons, and hypothetical reconstructions of Egyptian Dynastic history, inextricably mixed with an argument which claims to determine the relationship of kings to one another, and to reach a chronological result, it is again natural to suppose that the genealogy is produced in support of the dates. I apologise for my mistake, and accept Mr. Torr's assurance that so much of his book is irrelevant.

J. L. Myres.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Harvard Studies of Classical Philology. Vol. vi.

The Opisthodomus on the Acropolis of Athens, J. W. White. The writer argues (in opposition to the view of Milchhöfer, which is fully discussed) that the Opisthodomus was a separate building, and that it consisted of the three western chambers and the western portico which before the Persian wars formed part of the Hecatompedon. *Artemis Anäitis and Mên Tiamu, a votive Tablet in the Boston Museum*, J. H. Wright. A tablet with inscriptions and three figures in relief, dedicated (for the recovery of a son from sickness) to Artemis Anaitis and Mên Tiamu. The characteristics of the latter deity (Mên), and his relations to Sabazius, are fully discussed, and it is conjectured that the word Tiamu means *καταχθόνιος*. *The Date of Lycophron*, W. N. Bates. The dates arrived at are that Lycophron was born between 325 and 320, wrote the *Alexandra* about 295, was writing in the Alexandrian library 285, 284, and afterwards writing tragedies; and that his death must have occurred before 250 (on the assumption that the account of his death in the *Ibis* of Ovid was taken from the *Ibis* of Callimachus). *The Compounds of the verb iacio*, M. W. Mather. Discusses in all their parts the prosody and orthography of the various compounds of *iacio*. *Homeric quotations in Plato and Aristotle*, G. E. Howes. The quotations from Homeric poems in the writings of Plato and Aristotle are fully and carefully discussed with the especial view of gauging their value for textual criticism. He concludes that Plato's quotations, whether he quoted from memory or not, are to be carefully weighed, and not rejected merely because they vary from the traditional readings: similarly that, though there are passages where the presumption is that Aristotle quoted from memory and quoted wrongly, yet few of his variants can be summarily dismissed. At any rate in most cases where his quotations differ from the traditional text they probably give variants of high antiquity.

Vol. vii. (1896). *On the extent of the deliberate construction in relative clauses in Greek*, W. W. Goodwin. Discusses the views put forward by Mr. A. Sidgwick, Professor Tarbell, Dr. Earle, and Professor Gardner Hale in the *Classical Review* and in the *Transactions* of the American Philological Association. *Some features of the contrary to fact construction*, J. B. Greenough. A discussion of conditional sentences of the type 'si habeam dem,' 'si haberem darem,' with a suggestion (which surely could only hold good *at most* for orations and dialogue) that the construction was defined by tone of voice. *Studies in the text of Lucretius*, W. Everett. Observing (with cases in point) that Munro's text should not be accepted as a finality, he deals especially with errors in the readings of Brieger, among them his reading in vi. 83 where 'nubisque ponenda' ends the line! *On 'Os columnatum' and ancient instruments of confinement*, F. D. Allen. An explanation (probably correct) of the 'os columnatum' in Plaut. *M.G.* 211. The passage is also made a peg on which to hang a very useful and thorough discussion of the various methods by which prisoners were fettered or pilloried in Greek and Roman gaols. *Cicero's journey into exile*, C. L. Smith. Discusses the dates of the various stages in his journey from evidence in the *Letters* and elsewhere. *Five interesting Greek imperatives*, J. H. Wright. A full discussion of the forms in vase inscriptions *πίει*, *δέχοι*, *δίδοι* (in which it is argued that the last letter is the demonstrative suffix *-ī*, equivalent to the Latin *-ce*), *θίγες*, *πίεις*. *The plot of the Agamemnon*, L. Dyer. Discusses the difficulties about the *time* in the play, rejecting Dr. Verrall's view. The arrogance and excesses of the Greeks permitted by Agamemnon in the sack of Troy are to meet with swift retribution, and by bringing the return of Agamemnon so near to the sack of Troy the poet marks the swiftness of the divine punishment: the audience is taken from the night of the destruction of Troy to the morning of Agamemnon's return. *Musonius the Etruscan*, C. P. Parker. An examination of all the evidence about the life and teaching of Musonius Rufus. The writer traces two persons, Musonius Rufus, the Etruscan, born about 25 A.D., who taught at Rome in Nero's reign and whose opinions appear both in Persius and Epictetus, and Musonius the Tyrian, living in a Greek city early in the second century, who is quoted by Stobaeus and is to be identified with Musonius 'the Babylonian' mentioned by Philostratus. *On the anapaests of Aischylos*, H. W. Smyth. A classification of their metrical structure under the chief heads, *marching* and *melic* anapaests. *The dates of the exiles of Peisistratos*, H. N. Fowler. Argues that the dates derived from the text of *Ἀθ. Πολ.* do not disagree with the chronology of Herodotus: an appendix on Iophon, the son of Peisistratos. *Coronelli's maps of Athens*, J. R. Wheeler. These seventeenth century maps (of which reproductions are given) are derived partly from Guillet, partly from Spon, partly from records of the Venetian siege. *Notes on Persius*, M. H. Morgan. *Notes on Suetonius*, A. A. Howard. *Varia Critica*, H. W. Hagley. (Contains a full discussion of the word agino in Petron. c. 61 and its kindred). *A point of order in Greek and Latin*, J. W. H. Walden. The reasons for the order and position of the copula. *Omens and augury in Plautus*, C. B. Gulick. Among other terms which are discussed, *in mundo* is explained as 'on the augural horizon,' therefore 'foredoomed' or 'ready.'

THE following slight correction in my article of last month on Pylos and Sphacteria was too late to be made in proof.

p. 3 *note* 8. *J.H.S.* p. 67 should be *J.H.S.* p. 64. The similar walls referred to on p. 67 are on the North of Pylos. On that page, note 42, the word 'polygonal' should be deleted.

RONALD M. BURROWS.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN BOOKS.

Boissier (Gaston.) The country of Horace and Virgil, translated by D. H. Fisher. 8vo. 11, 346 pp. New York, Putnams. $1.

Book of Judges in Greek, according to the text of Codex Alexandrinus. Edited by A. E. Brooke and N. McLean. Crown 8vo. Cambridge Univ. Press. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Caesar. History of the Helvetian War: de bello Gallico I., 1–29. With notes and vocabulary by E. S. Shuckburgh. 12mo. 96 pp. Cambridge Univ. Press. 1*s.* 6*d.*

—— the same with notes and vocabulary by A. H. Allcroft and F. G. Plaistowe. Crown 8vo. 76 pp. Clive 1*s.* 6*d.*

Gardner (E. A.) Handbook of Greek sculpture. Crown 8vo. 588 pp. Macmillan. 10*s.*

Hatch (E.) and H. A. Redpath. Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek versions of the Old Testament including the Apocryphal Books. Part 6. 4to. Frowde. £1 1*s.*

Herodotus. The text. Canon Rawlinson's translation; notes abridged by A. J. Grant. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 888 pp., maps, plans. Murray. 12*s.*

Holm (A.) The history of Greece. Translated from the German. (4 vols.) Vol. III. 8vo. 470 pp. Macmillan 6*s.* net.

Hunter (W. A.) Roman Law and the Institutes of Justinian. Introduction to the study. Fifth Edition. Crown 8vo. Sweet & M. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Morris (W. H.) Greek lessons. Thirteenth Edition. Parts I. II. in 1 vol. 16mo. 138 pp. Longmans. 3*s.*

Moulton (F. P.) Preparatory Latin composition, with collaboration by W. C. Collar. 12mo. 13, 142 pp. Boston, Ginn. 90 cts.

Smith (Sir W.) Smaller History of Greece, new edition, revised by G. E. Marindin. Crown 8vo. 282 pp., coloured maps, plans, engravings. Murray. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Suetonius. Stories of the Caesars. Selections from the lives of Julius and Augustus. With notes and vocabulary by H. Wilkinson. 18mo. 138 pp. Macmillan. 1*s.* 6*d.*

Tarbell (F. B.) History of Greek Art. With introductory chapter on art in Egypt and Mesopotamia. Crown 8vo. 296 pp. Macmillan. 6*s.*

Vergilius. Eneid, Book I. With introduction, notes, and vocabulary by A. H. Allcroft and W. E. Masom. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. Clive. 3*s.*

Vergilius. The Eclogues, translated into English hexameter verse by Sir Gge. Osborne Morgan. 4to. 64 pp. Frowde. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

White (J. W.) The first Greek book. Square 16mo. 5, 62 pp. Boston, Ginn. $1. 35.

Zeller (E.) Aristotle and the earlier Peripatetics, translated from 'Philosophy of the Greeks' by B. F. C. Costelloe and J. H. Muirhead. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 1054 pp. Longmans. £1 4*s.*

FOREIGN BOOKS.

Aeschylus. Plüss (T.) Die Tragödie Agamemnon und das Tragische. 4to. 40 pp. Basel.

—— Preuss (A.) De versuum iambicorum in melicis partibus usu Aeschyleo. 8vo. 118 pp. Leipzig, Gräfe. 2 Mk. 50.

Anthologia latina sive poesis latinae supplementum, ed. Franc. Buecheler et A. Riese. Pars II. Carmina latina epigraphica, conlegit F. Buecheler. Fasc. II. 8vo. pp. 399-921. Leipzig, Teubner. 5 Mk. 20.

Aristophanes. Römer (A.) Zur Kritik und Exegese der Wolken des Aristophanes. 8vo. 36 pp. München.

Arndt (W.) Schrifttafeln zur Erlernung der lateinischen Palaeographie. Pt. 1. Third Edition, by M. Tangl. Folio. 9 pp., 30 plates. Berlin, Grote. 15 Mk.

Barth (H.) De Coorum titulorum dialecto. 8vo. vi, 125 pp. Basel.

Beloch (Jul.) Griechische Geschichte. Vol. II. (Bis auf Aristoteles und die Eroberung Asiens.) 8vo. 13, 713 pp., 1 map. Strassburg, Trübner. 9 Mk.

Borchardt (L.) Bericht über den baulichen Zustand der Tempelbauten auf Philae. 8vo. 17 pp., engravings. Berlin.

Bräunl (J.) Beitrag zu einer Parallelgrammatik des Deutschen, Griechischen und Lateinischen. 8vo. 30 pp. Arnau.

Caesar's Bellum Gallicum. Textausgabe für den Schulgebrauch von T. H. Schmalz. 12mo. xx, 248 pp., 1 plate, 1 map. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 20.

—— Commentarii cum A. Hirtii aliorumque supplementis ex rec. B. Kübleri. Vol. III., p. i. Commentarius de bello Alexandrino, rec. B. Kübler. Commentarius de bello Africo, rec. E. Wölfflin. 12mo. xliv, 104 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk.

Cecaumeni Strategicon et incerti scriptoris de officiis regiis libellus. Ediderunt B. Wassiliewsky, V. Jernstedt. 8vo. 113 pp., 1 plate. St. Petersburg, Hoenniger. 3 Mk.

Cicero. Brandt (S.) Ad Ciceronis de re publica libros adnotationes. 4to. 10 pp. Heidelberg.

Critias. Patrick (H. N.) De Critiae operibus. Pedestri oratione conscriptis. 8vo. 56 pp. Jena.

Cybulski (Steph.) Tabulae, quibus antiquitates graecae et romanae illustrantur. Nr. 10. The Greek House. Erklärender text. 8vo. 18 pp., engravings. Leipzig, Köhler's Baarsort. 40 Pf.

Demosthenes' neun Philippische Reden. Textausgabe für den Schulgebrauch von Th. Thalheim. 8vo. xiv, 144 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk.

—— Schefczik (H.) Ueber die Abfassungszeit der ersten philippischen Rede des Demosthenes. 8vo. 29 pp. Troppau.

Dio Chrysostomus. Hahn (K.) De Dionis Chrysostomi rationibus, quae inscribuntur Diogenes. 8vo. 73 pp. Göttingen.

Fegerl (J.) Die physikalischen Kenntnisse der Alten, entnommen den wichtigsten Stellen der Autoren. 8vo. 34 pp. Mähr. Neustadt.

Fischbach (O.) Silbermünzen der römischen Republik aus Steiermark. 8vo. 16 pp., 2 engravings. Graz.

Gilbert (Gust.) Beiträge zur Entwickelungsgeschichte des griechischen Gerichts verfahrens und des griechischen Rechtes. (Aus 'Jahrbücher für class. Philol, Suppl. vol. 23.) 8vo. 96 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk. 60.

Goutmy (E.) Le Parthénon et le génie grec. 12mo. xxxv, 303 pp., plate. Paris, Colin.

Handbuch der klassischen Alterthumswissenschaft von I. von Müller. Halbband 22 and 23. (Atlas zu Vol. VI. Archaeologie der Kunst von K. Sittl.) Oblong folio. 64 plates, containing 1,000 engravings, 28 pp. (Indices.) München, Beck. 13 Mk. 50.

Heberdey (Rud.) und Ad. Wilhelm, Reisen in Kilikien, ausgeführt 1891 und 1892 im Auftrag der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften. 4to. 168 pp., engravings, map (by H. Kiepert.) (Aus. Denkschriften der K. Akademie der Wiss.) Wien, Gerold. 13 Mk. 70.

Heraclides. Voss (O.) De Heraclides Pontici vita et scriptis. 8vo. 95 pp. Rostock.

Holder (Alfr.) Altceltischer Sprachschatz. Part 9. (Vol. II., Col. 1–256.) 8vo. Leipzig, Teubner. 8 Mk.

Holm (Ad.), W. Deecke, W. Soltau, Kulturgeschichte des Klassischen Alterthums. (Sonderabdruck aus Hellwald's Kulturgeschichte, Fourth Edition. Vol. II.) Royal 8vo. xii, 594 pp., 318 engravings, 7 plates, 2 maps. Leipzig, Friesenhahn 10 Mk.

Homerus. Molhuysen (P. C.) de tribus Homeri Odysseae codicibus antiquissimis. 8vo. 154 pp., 5 plates. Leiden, Sijthoff. 4 Mk. 20.

—— Zachl (T.) De Amesi quae vulgo dicitur in Iliade et Odyssea Homeri. 8vo. 33 pp. Baden.

Homoly (M.) Statue de bronze découverte à Delphes. 8vo. 27 pp., 4 plates. Paris, Imprim. Nation.

Horatius. Hawrlant (F.) Horaz als Freund der Natur nach seinen Gedichten. II. Theil. 8vo. 26 pp. Landskron.

—— Raiz (A.) Die Frage nach der Anordnung der Horazischen Oden. Eine kritische Uebersicht. 8vo. 14 pp. Graz.

—— Wagner (J.) Collation einer Horazhandschrift aus dem 12. Jahrhundert. 8vo. 58 pp. Kalksburg.

Huemer (C.) Die Sage von Orest in der tragischen Dichtung. 8vo. 34 pp. Linz.

Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft, begründet von C. Bursian, herausgegeben von I. v. Müller. Vol. 87. Supplementary Volume, Final Part (4–6): Jahresbericht über die griechische Epigraphik für 1888–1894. von W. Larfeld. 8vo. III pp. and pp. 289–495. Berlin, Calvary. 8 Mk. 40.

Joannes Antiochenus. Rüger (A.) Präpositionen bei Johannes Antiochus. I. Teil. 8vo. 38 pp. Münnerstadt.

Josephus (Flavius.) Antiquitatum iudaicarum epitoma, ed. Ben. Niese. 4to. x, 369 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 15 Mk.

—— Drüner (H.) Untersuchungen über Josephus. 8vo. 94 pp. Marburg.

Juvenalis. Höhler (W.) Die Cornutus-Scholien zum I. Buch der Satiren Juvenals. (Aus Jahrbücher für class. Philol. Suppl. Vol. 23.) 8vo. 63 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk. 40.

Kluge (H.) Die Schrift der Mykenier. Eine Untersuchung über System und Lautwerth der von A. J. Evans entdeckten vorphönizischen Schriftzeichen. 8vo. 8, 110 pp., 4 plates and 80 engravings. Cöthen, Schulze. 8 Mk.

Köhler (U.) Zur Geschichte des athenischen Münzwesens. 8vo. 9 pp., 1 plate. Berlin.

Kubitschek (J. W.) Rundschau über das letztverflossene Quinquennium der antiken Numismatik. (1890–1894.) 8vo. 62 pp. Wien.

Lactantius. Knappitsch (A.) De L. Caeli Firmiani Lactanti 'ave Phoenice.' 8vo. 39 pp. Graz.

Larfeld (W.) Bericht über die griechische Epigraphik für 1888–1894. (Aus Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der class. Alterthumswissenschaft.) 8vo. 371 pp Berlin. 12 Mk.

Le Blant (E.) Sept cent cinquante inscriptions de pierres gravées inédites ou peu connues. 4to. 214 pp., 2 plates. Paris, Klincksieck.

Limes (der obergermanisch-rätische) des Römerreichs. Herausgegeben von O. v. Sarwey und F. Hettner. Part IV. 4to. 6, 9, 7, 10 pp., engravings, 7 plates, map. Heidelberg, Petters. 3 Mk. 60.

Linden (E.) De bello civili Sullano. 8vo. 68 pp. Freiburg.

Lindskog (C.) Quaestiones de parataxi et hypotaxi apud priscos latinos. 8vo. iv, 95 pp. Lund.

Lucretius Carus, de rerum natura Buch III. erklärt von Rich. Heinze. 8vo. vi, 206 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 4 Mk.

Meurer (M.) Die Ursprungsformen des griechischen Akanthus-Ornaments und ihre natürlichen Vorbilder. Royal 8vo. iv, 43 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 1 Mk. 60.

Meyer (Gust.) Griechische Grammatik. Third Edition. 8vo. xviii, 715 pp. Leipzig, Breitkopf and H. 13 Mk.

Oblak (V.) Macedonische Studien. Nach dem Tode des Verfassers im Drucke besorgt und mit einem Anhang versehen von V. Jagic. 8vo. 156 pp. Wien.

Ott (Ludw.) Beiträge zur Kenntniss des griechischen Eides. 8vo. 153 pp. Leipzig, Fock. 2 Mk.

Pernice (E.) Griechisches Pferdegeschirr im Antiquarium der kgl. Museen in Berlin. (56. Winckelmannprogramm.) 4to. 36 pp., 23 engravings, 3 plates. Berlin, Reimer. 4 Mk.

Philodemus. Perron (H.) Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Philodem's Oeconomicus. 8vo. 85 pp. Zürich.

Planta (R. v.) Grammatik der oskisch-umbrischen Dialecte. Vol. II. Formenlehre, Syntax. Sammlung der Inschriften, Glossen. Anhang. Glossar. 8vo. xv, 772 pp. Strassburg, Trübner. 20 Mk.

Plato. Opera omnia rec. et commentariis instr. God. Stallbaum. Vol. VIII., Sectio II. Sophista. Ed. II. rec., prolegomenis et commentariis instr. O. Apelt. 8vo. viii, 217 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 5 Mk. 60.

The Classical Review

APRIL 1897.

THE MINOR WORKS OF XENOPHON.

(*Continued from* p. 21.)

VI., VII. The Constitutions.

In dealing with the two *Constitutions* that have come down to us under the name of Xenophon, I shall not enter upon a general discussion of all the grounds for asserting or impugning the genuineness of either of them. So far as these grounds consist in the matter of the two works, they have been very fully discussed, and I at any rate am not capable of adducing any fresh argument. I wish however to submit the language in which they are written to a somewhat closer scrutiny than it has as yet received, and to see what conclusions, if any, can be drawn from it as to the questions of probable date and authorship. It will be best to begin with the *Respublica Lacedaemoniorum* and to go on subsequently to the *Respublica Atheniensium*. After discussing in both cases the language and any inferences that may be drawn from it, I shall offer a few suggestions on particular passages.

F. Haase's edition of the *R.L.* (1833) contains some remarks on the diction and a discriminating verbal index. Cobet in the *Novae Lectiones* (1858) pointed out two or three things as regards the language, especially a few more or less technical Spartan terms. He had on further study changed his mind as to the authorship (Preface, p. xxiv.) and had satisfied himself that the *R.L.* was a genuine work of X. He relies however mainly on some things in the contents of the book, and his observations on the language, weighty as anything of Cobet's on such a subject must be, are very slight. In *Xenophontis Opuscula Politica Equestria et Venatica* (Oxford, 1866) L. Dindorf points out certain words and constructions which in his opinion tell against X.'s authorship. E. Naumann (*De Xenophontis libro qui* Λακεδαιμονίων Πολιτεία *inscribitur:* Berlin, 1876) and H. Bazin (*La République des Lacédémoniens de Xénophon:* Paris, 1885) examine the language with some care and come to a conclusion opposite to Dindorf's.

Useful as is the work which these writers have done, it is not unfair to say that they have left untouched a large, perhaps the larger, part of the material available. More particularly they have taken little notice of various points of grammatical usage, which are of great importance in an inquiry like this, such as certain uses of conjunctions and other small but frequent words. To a considerable proportion of the facts now to be stated attention has not, to the best of my belief, hitherto been called. No doubt there are more which could be added. My list has no pretensions to be complete, and I shall be quite satisfied if the statements in it are correct as far as they go. With our present insufficient supply of trustworthy indexes and lexicons to particular authors it is not easy to make sure of one's

facts. Sturz's *Lexicon Xenophonteum* (1801–1804), though old, has been very useful: from Sauppe's *Lexilogus Xenophonteus* (1869) I have not got as much assistance as I hoped. When Joost has followed up his study of the *Anabasis* (*Was ergiebt sich aus dem Sprachgebrauch Xenophon's in der Anabasis für die Behandlung der griechischen Syntax in der Schule?* Berlin, 1892) by similar studies of the other larger works, our resources for dealing with a question like the present will be considerably increased.

In the first place let us notice that the use of final conjunctions in the *R.L.* is quite in accordance with the practice of X. (see Goodwin's *M. and T.* espec. Appendix iii. and iv.). Final ὡς, which is almost peculiar to him among Attic prose-writers, occurs three times (2, 6 : 13, 1 : 15, 5): ὅπως seven times, and ἵνα four. Weber has shown that in most of the works of X. ὡς and ὅπως together are used more freely than ἵνα, the conjunction common in Aristophanes, Plato, and the orators. The unattic use of ὡς and ὡς ἄν with 'object clauses' after ἐπιμελεῖσθαι etc. occurs 3, 3 : 6, 1 : 14, 4. X. has a third frequent but unattic use of ὡς, the use = ὥστε, which we find in Herodotus and Hippocrates with the infinitive and sometimes with the indicative. (In Herodotus Cobet has altered infinitive to indicative quite needlessly). This use is found in the *R.L.* 5, 3 and 8 : 11, 6 etc., and Madvig has no reason whatever for altering the ὡς in 5, 8 to ὥστε. Very characteristic of X. is the Herodotean and unattic use of ἕστε for ἕως in both senses, 'while' and 'until.' Goodwin (§ 617) says 'in Attic prose (especially in X.),' but is it ever used in Attic prose except by X.? It occurs here 11, 8 and 9. The temporal use of ἐπεί, which is, I imagine, quite uncommon in the orators, who use ἐπειδή instead, though frequent enough in Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon, will be found in 1, 1 and 5 and 2, 1. Ἔνθα 'where,' used when a writer of pure Attic prose would put οὗ, ὅπου, ἵνα, οἷ—Demosthenes, for instance, does not use ἔνθα once, nor does Lysias—occurs 3, 4 : 5, 7 etc. This use is constant in X. The adverbial ᾗ of manner (9, 3 : 10, 1 etc.) is much commoner in X. than in the orators. The phrase in 1, 3 σίτῳ ᾗ ἀνυστὸν μετριωτάτῳ is thus doubly Xn., for ἀνυστόν is not a word of ordinary Attic, but occurs *Anab.* 1, 8, 11 in the similar phrase σιγῇ ὡς ἀνυστόν . . προσῆσαν. It has been pretty well known since 1874, when Tycho Mommsen published his figures, that X. differs from all Attic prose-writers in preferring σύν to μετά. Thus, according to Mommsen, in Thucydides σύν occurs only 37 times, and μετά with a genitive 400, but in X. μετά with a genitive occurs 275 times, and σύν 556. In the *R.L.* σύν will be found in 8, 5 : 13, 1 and 2 : μετά I think only in 11, 7. The preposition ἀμφί = περί is well known to be characteristic of X., and so is the phrase τὰ ἀμφί τι: we have here in 7, 2 τὰ ἀμφὶ χρηματισμόν. X. several times uses παρά in the sense of 'close to,' 'alongside of,' etc. with verbs of rest, e.g. *de Re Eq.* 8, 12 ἕως μὲν ἂν παρὰ τοὺς φίλους τις ᾖ: *Cyr.* 1, 4, 18 εἶπεν αὐτῷ μένειν παρ' ἑαυτόν: we have here in 12, 2 φυλακάς γε μὴν ἐποίησε μεθημερινὰς τὰς μὲν παρὰ τὰ ὅπλα εἴσω βλεπούσας. Πρόσθεν, which X. uses very often instead of the more usual Attic ἔμπροσθεν, occurs in 13, 6. (Cobet, *N.L.* p. 688, when he altered πρόσθεν in *Mem.* 1, 4, 6 to ἔμπροσθεν, had perhaps not noticed X.'s practice. Πρόσθεν is the older word, as appears from ἔμπροσθεν not occurring in Homer, and from there being no phrase ἔμπροσθεν . . πρίν κ.τ.λ. We may doubt whether τοὔμπροσθεν is right in Eur. *Hipp.* 1228, since it seems to be the only place in tragedy where ἔμπροσθεν is found). Throughout the treatise the Xn. γε μήν is of very frequent occurrence: καί—δέ, which is also very common in X. and by no means equally so in all prose-writers, occurs a dozen times, and the double τε, rare in Attic prose but used sometimes by X., may be found in 1, 9. In other respects too the statistics given by Roquette (*De Xenophontis Vita*, p. 39), who takes no notice of καί—δέ, seem to show that the use of particles is thoroughly Xn.

Very many other words may be found in the *R.L.* which belong to the peculiar vocabulary of X. In 12, 5 μάσσω has been restored for ἐλάσσω, just as in *Cyr.* 2, 4, 27 μάσσων was corrected to ἐλάσσων by L. Dindorf following Suidas *s.v.* μάσσων. X. also uses the unattic μήκιστος. Μείων (= ἧττων or ἐλάττων) and μειονεκτεῖν, μειονεξία are thoroughly Xn.; these words occur 9, 1 : 11, 9. Κρατύνω (2, 3), ἀρήγω (4, 5), πεπαμένος (6, 4), κατάρχω (8, 2), σίνομαι (12, 5), are verbs which occur seldom or never in ordinary Attic, but they may be found in X., ἀρήγω constantly. Such too are ἐρευνῶ (7, 6), a Platonic word hardly used in common language, and ἐπικουρῶ (2, 6 etc.) which seems to occur only once in an orator. Ἕπομαι (8, 2 etc.) is avoided by the orators, very frequent in X. and not rare in Plato. Κλωπεύω (2, 7) is used in *Anab.* 6, 1, 1. Ῥᾳδιουργῶ and ῥᾳδιουργία (2, 2 and 14, 4) are regular Xn. words, but occur nowhere in the orators nor in Plato, once in a fragment

of the New Comedy, and once in a pseudo-Aristotelian work. Βλακεύω (2, 9) is hardly found in other Attic writers, but X. is fond of it and kindred words. The same may be said of μεγαλύνομαι (8, 2). The uses of ἀποδεικνύναι = 'ordain' (10, 7), of διαπράττειν (2, 10) and κατεργάζεσθαι (9, 1), all with accusative and infinitive, may be paralleled from other Xn. writings, but hardly elsewhere. Πληγὰς ἐμβάλλειν (6, 2) seems not to be found out of X.

X.'s favourite and peculiar use of ἰσχυρῶς = πάνυ, σφόδρα etc., occurs in 2, 2 and 3, 4. Μεγάλως, which is used occasionally by X. and Plato but not by the orators, occurs in 10, 4. Πάμπαν, unknown to Thucydides, to the orators, and except for one Aristophanic hexameter (*Peace* 121) to the comic poets, occurs in 1, 3 and elsewhere in X., as it does now and then in Plato. Ὡσαύτως (6, 3) may be described in almost the same terms (three or four times in Demosthenes). Πυκνά = πολλάκις may be found in 12, 5 and elsewhere in X. Τῷ παντί (8, 5), with comparatives and similar expressions is thoroughly Xn. The use of ὅσα in 5, 7 τῇ ὄρφνῃ ὅσα ἡμέρᾳ χρηστέον is found in *Hell.* 6, 1, 15 : *Cyr.* 1, 5, 12. Εὐφροσύνη is a substantive known to us chiefly from Homer and other poets, but X. is addicted to the use of it, and we have it here in 7, 6. Τέκνα for παῖδες occurs in 1, 8 and τεκνοποιεῖσθαι, τεκνοποιία, εὔτεκνος in the same chapter : Thucydides, the orators and even Plato avoid using τέκνον : Aristophanes has it only in burlesque or in touches of real poetry ; but X. uses it very often.

Finally I believe that the following words of various kinds, though not confined in use to the works of X., will be recognised as belonging more or less to his vocabulary by those who have given attention to it : διαθρύπτω (2, 1), μεγαλείως (4, 6), ἥλιξ (5, 5), ἄφοδος (5, 7), ἡδυπάθεια (7, 3), ὁμογνώμων (8, 1), κακοδαιμονία (9, 3), καλοκἀγαθία (10, 1), ἀνυπόστατος (10, 7), σχολαι(ό)τατα (11, 3), γοργός (11, 3), παρεγγύησις (11, 4 : X. does not use this word elsewhere, but he has παρεγγυᾶν constantly and παρεγγύη *Anab.* 6, 5, 13 : παραγγέλλω, παραγγελία are the ordinary Attic) ; ἐθελούσιος (13, 7), ὑπερφέρειν (15, 3 and 8).

If now, looking to the other side of the argument, we ask whether there is anything in the language which tells strongly against X.'s authorship, the question may in spite of Dindorf be answered confidently in the negative. In 1, 5 σφῶν αὐτῶν = ἀλλήλων, and as far as Sturz's lexicon shows, there is no other certain instance of this use in X. Two words seem to be of late date, μειρακιοῦσθαι (3, 1) and ἐμφυσιῶσαι (3, 4), but the quotation in Stobaeus gives us ἐμφῦσαι for the second, and εἰς τὸ μειρακιοῦσθαι is probably a later addition to ἐκ παίδων ἐκβαίνωσι. In 8, 4 ἱκανοί (= κύριοι) εἰσι ζημιοῦν may be a mistake : so perhaps is the odd phrase εἰς τὰ ἔσχατα μάλα σοφός in 1, 2. Παύειν ἀπό τινος (3, 1) is at least unusual (cf. ἐκ and ἀπό with ἀπαλλάττειν, ἀπαλλάττεσθαι) and so are the phrases οἱ ἐκ δημοσίου (3, 3) and ἐπὶ πόλεως (11, 2), the use of περᾶν of time in 4, 7 τοῖς τὴν ἡβητικὴν ἡλικίαν πεπερακόσιν, and the use of καὶ μὴν after τε, if right, in 5, 7. Κατεστάθη (15, 1) is not a common form, but it occurs (ἐστάθην) in *Hell.* 3, 1, 9 : 5, 2, 43 as well as in the orators (Veitch, who does not cite this passage). With τῶν δεομένων γίγνεσθαι (13, 7) compare *Cyr.* 2, 3, 3 τῶν πράττεσθαι δεομένων. All these points are very trifling.

There are a fair number of words that occur perhaps nowhere else in X., but this is in no way surprising. Each of his works taken separately presents words of which the same may be said, and not one of the words in the *R. L.* except μειρακιοῦσθαι and ἐμφυσιῶσαι need give rise to any suspicion. A few of them (συσκήνια, ἀστυφέλικτος, ἐπὶ φρουρᾶς, etc.) are, as Cobet pointed out, technical Spartan terms, quite natural in this treatise. Some again belong to the class most characteristic of X., that are otherwise known to us only or mainly from their use in the poets, though no doubt it was not from the poets that they were taken by X. the traveller, the Athenian who lived with Ionians and Dorians of various communities. Such are ἔκγονα (1, 4) : γεραιός (1, 7 : γεραίτεροι is frequent in X.) : ἀναθρώσκω (2, 3, found in Herodotus) : ῥαδινός (2, 6) : ὄρφνη (5, 7 : ὄρφνινος used of colour *Cyr.* 8, 3, 3) : ἐπίκλησις (9, 4 : Herodotus and Thucydides) : τέρμα (10, 1 : used literally *Cyr.* 8, 3, 25) : ἐκτελεῖν (10, 7) : ἀραιός (11, 6) : κνεφαῖος (13, 3 : κνέφας in *Anab.* 4, 5, 9 and elsewhere) : λῃς = λεία (13, 11) : ἐπιψογος (14, 7. cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 611, where it is active in meaning). Τορός (2, 11) is another word, partly of the same kind. Cobet had no need to alter τὸν τορώτατον ('the smartest') τῶν εἰρένων to τὸν πρεσβύτατον, as is shown by Plat. *Theaet.* 175 E τορῶς τε καὶ ὀξέως διακονεῖν and Ar. *Ran.* 1102 κἀπερείδεσθαι τορῶς. Διάκορος (1, 5) used by Herodotus and in the form διακορής by Plato, is just such a word as we should expect to find in X. Εὐχερής, εὐχέρεια are not used by him elsewhere, but εὐχερέστερον is not at all strange in 2, 5 and Aristotle *H. A.* 8, 6, 2

offers an exact parallel for the sense in which it is used. So ῥυπαίνεται (11, 3) is paralleled by ῥυπαίνουσι Ar. *Eth.* 1, 8, 1099b 2, and the adjectival παράλογος (5, 3) occurs several times in Aristotle (παραλόγως the adverb in Demosthenes). X. and Aristotle often have words in common. Ἀποκαθιστάναι 'restore' (6, 3) seems to occur elsewhere only in late authors, but this may be accidental and is the case with many Thucydidean words. The very curious use of νομίζω (1, 7: 2, 4: 12, 3) hereafter to be noticed, should be mentioned here.

There is one more argument from the language which should not be left out of account, and which tells, if not for, at any rate not against Xn. authorship. This is the argument from hiatus. It is well known that in this matter the rules by which many writers and speakers of the fourth century bound themselves with various degrees of strictness were not recognised by X. any more than by Thucydides, though Benseler (*De Hiatu* p. 197) makes a partial exception with regard to the first two chapters of the *Memorabilia*. The writer of the *R. L.* also disregards them altogether. This is far from constituting an argument in X.'s favour: but perhaps we may say that, if the *R. L.* had been of later date, there is a greater likelihood that some care would have been taken to avoid hiatus. One theory of the authorship at any rate seems to be discredited by this observation, namely the theory of Lehmann, who attributes the work to a pupil of Isocrates. No pupil of Isocrates is likely to have been so careless of hiatus as this writer shows himself, nor indeed so indiscriminate in his vocabulary, a matter about which Isocrates was very particular.

Although then Dindorf ventured to say that the whole style was *eiusmodi ut, quo magis quis assuetus sit Xenophonti, eo minus eum sit in hoc libro agnituru*s, the considerations here adduced will probably be allowed to be very much in favour of the traditional view that the *R. L.* is the genuine work of X. and that it is so throughout. There is not in the language any sign of patchwork and the intrusion of a later hand. The words on which I have laid stress occur in all parts of the treatise: there is no chapter in which some of them may not be found. Even the fourteenth, on which especial doubt has been thrown and which seems to be at least out of its proper place, presents an instance of final ὡς and of two more or less noticeable Xn. words (πρόσθεν twice and ῥαδιουργία). It would be quite consistent with these facts to hold that the treatise is incomplete, a mere fragment or fragments of what X. wrote or perhaps meant to write, but they go very much against the view that we have in it the work of anyone but X. himself.

H. Richards.

(To be continued.)

GREEK METRICAL INSCRIPTIONS FROM PHRYGIA.

(Continued from page 32.)

VI.

Found at Doghan Arslan, near Spore of the Preq enisseis.

[εις.
εἰσβαιν?]ων οἴμους πολυ[π]ειρ[ή]τοιο κέλευθου
ἤλυθες ἀ[μφὶ κ]όρης [σ]ώματος ἱδροσύνας,
τέρπει δ' ἀψίδεσσι πολυτροχά[λ]οις ἐνὶ κέντρ[οι]ς
ἄντυγος αἰθερίης τείρεσι λαμπομέναις,
ἠελίῳ τ' ἀνὰ μέσσα πολυ[φ]εγγεῖ τε σελήνῃ,
ἐξ ὧν δὴ πάντων ἐστι βίος μερόπων.
ἐν τούτο[ι]ς φύεται τρέφεται γήρᾳ τε τελεῖται
ζωῆς κ(αὶ) θανάτου κλῆρος ἐν οἷς πέλεται.
τῆσδε μαθημοσύνης Ἐπιτύχανον ἴδριν ἐόντα,
πνοιῆς δ' ἀ[π]λάνκτους εἰδότα μαντοσύνας,
θέσφατά τ' ἀνθρώποισιν ἀληθέα φημίζοντα
ὄντων μέλλοντων ἐσσομένων πρότερο[ν.
ἄστεσι δ' ἐν πολλοῖσιν ἰθαγενέων λάχε τειμάς,
λείψας κ(αὶ) κούρους οὐδὲν ἀφαυροτέρους.
σφῇ δ' ἀρετῇ κ(αὶ) μέτρα δαεὶς κ(αὶ) πείρατα κόσμου
εἰς ὄρ(φ)ην ἱκόμην πᾶσιν ὀφειλομένην.

This is the imperfect epitaph of an astrologer, by name Epitynchanos (v. 10), whose sons carried on the profession after his death (v. 15). ['This Epitynchanos, citizen of many cities (v. 14), is probably the same person who acted as High-priest at Akmonia

and as an agent in the persecution of Diocletian and his successor. He and his family are described in a remarkable inscription, dated A.D. 315, which is published in my *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, ii. p. 566, No. 467.' W. M. R.]

Of new words the inscription contains the following :—πολυπείρητος (2), ἱδροσύνη (3), and μαθημοσύνη (10)—the compound πολυμαθημοσύνη occurs. 3. Note the change of persons, very often found in such inscriptions. Here first person speaks : the third in v. 4 ff., while the first person is resumed in 16-17. 4–5. Tr. 'And at their much-revolving centres he takes his joy with (heaven's) vaults, (which are) studded with constellations of aery orbit.' τέρπει : in middle sense = τέρπεται ; perhaps a solitary instance of this use. The expression πολυτρόχαλοι ἀγοραί is found in Christodorus (i.e. *Anthol. Pal.* ii. 15) ; = *contiones mobiles* (H. Grotius). κέντρον in this sense is found in Manetho's *Apotelesmatica* (*passim*). Manetho has also the adjectives ἄκεντρος, ἀπόκεντρος, ἐπίκεντρος. 6. The long υ in πολυφ. is noteworthy. 10. The sudden change to the acc. is frequent on such stones. Other names got from τύχη, τυγχάνω, are Εὔτυχος, Σύντυχος, Συντύχη, etc. (see Pape-Benseler). 11. εἰδότα μαντοσύνας = ἴδμονα μαντοσυνάων (Manetho, *Apotelesm.* iii. 317). 12–13. Take πρότερον closely with φημίζοντα. 15. λείψας : Veitch has exx. of this aorist. οὐδὲν ἀφαυροτέρους : perhaps an echo of Aratus, *Phaenom.* 227, οὐδὲν ἀφαυρότερον. 16. For σφῇ = ἐμῇ cf. Monro, *Homeric Grammar* § 255 (2). 17. ἰκόμην : note the short ι.

VII.

In stone-cutter's yard at Kutaya : brought from Kara Agatch Euren.

Τὸν πάσης ἀρετῆς κὲ ἐν ἀνδράσι κῦδος ἔχοντα
Μοντανὸν—καθορᾷς—κατέχει, ξένε, οὗτος ὁ τύνβος,
τὸν πατρίδος προνοοῦντα, πᾶσιν πεφιλημένον ἄνδρα,
Μοντανὸν, στέφανον πατρίδος, βουλευτῶν γένος ἐν πρώτοις,
ἐνδόξων γονέων Κυρίλλου τε πατρὸς Πρόκλης τε τεκούσης,
τὸν καὶ πᾶσα πατρὶς ποθ[έ]ει Α(μ)μία τε σύνευνος,
ὃν προέπεψε πατρὶς [γ]αία δῆμοί τε τοσοῦτοι,
κλαίοντες μέγαν ἄνδρα εἰς Ἀίδαο περῶντα.
εἴ τις τῆσδε γλυφῆς δολίας χ[ε]ῖρας προσενενκ[ε]ῖ,
ἄτεκνος ἄτυμβος ἀνανχίστευτος ὀλ[ε]ῖται·
[δ]ν κὲ τέκνα ποθητὰ τιμῆς μεγάλης προέπειψαν.
Αὐρ. Μεσσαλῖνος κὲ Μοντανὸς κὲ Ζωτικὸς κὲ Ἀντέρως
κὲ Πρόκλα γονεῦσιν μνήμης χάριν ἵδρυσαν.

2. Μοντανὸν may be governed by καθορᾷς : if so, κατέχει must govern αὐτὸν understood. M. seems to have been a common name in Phrygia ; see *s.v.* Montanus (the heretic), in Smith's *Dict. Chr. Biogr.* κατέχει : a *vox propria* of the tomb. 3. The α of πᾶσιν must be scanned short. Other anomalies in quantity are :—Κυρίλλου (5) ; Α(μ)μία (6) ; γαῖα (7), if so written, but I have given in the text the form γαία, which co-existed by the side of the usual γαῖα ; εἰς (8), where the engraver may have intended to write the form ἐς ; Ἀΐδαο (8) ; ἄτεκνος and ἄτυμβος (10) ; κὲ (11) as compared with κἔ (1) ; τῖμῆς (11). 4. The metre is lost altogether after βουλευτῶν. στεφ. πατρ. an expression quite natural, as applied to a person, to which I can find no parallel. 5. Has a foot extra. 6. πᾶσα πατρὶς 'his whole fatherland.' 7. Citizens of many cities followed him to the grave. 9. γλυφῆς refers to the bas-relief on the tomb-stone, representing the deceased Montanus. The clause εἴ τις . . . . προσενενκεῖ is usually followed in inscriptions of Eumeneia, not by an imprecation, as here, but by mention of a fine payable to the fiscus, or some other public institution : see the abundant testimony in Ramsay's *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, chap. x., App. 1. 10. ἀναγχίστευτος (a word not given by Liddell and Scott) = without ἀγχιστεῖς, or 'next of kin,' to keep up the family *sacra* (Meier and Schömann's *Attische Process*, by Lipsius p. 581 ff.). 11. τιμ. μεγ. 'at great expense.' 12. Αὐρ. (cf. i. 1) = Αὐρήλιος, a frequent *praenomen* in the second century, and later, derived from the *gens* name of the Antonines. 13. γονεῦσιν, plural, though there is no mention of the mother previously.

VIII.

τὸν θεὸν σοὶ (*i.e.* σὺ) μὴ ἀδικαίσις (*i.e.* ἀδικήσεις)

Ἀμμίας κὲ Κυριλλα[ς
κὲ Τατιαῆς

Open *tabellae* or *codex*.

Ἀέραον τόδε σῆμα ἀνὴρ εἴδρυσε γυναικί
Ἐλπίζων Κυρίλλῃ, κὲ πέντε τέκνοισιν ἀώροις,
ἐξ ἑτέροιο γάμου Κυρίλλης δύο θρεπτοῖς
καὶ τρισὶ τοῖς ἰδίοις, Ζωίλῳ ἠδὲ [θυ]γατρὶ
Τατιανῇ κ(αὶ) νύνφῃ Κυρίλλῃ ταχυ[μ]οίροις
κὲ ζῶν αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ.

A man named Elpizon (Bunyan's 'Hopeful') erects this tomb to his wife Kyrilla, and five children (two of them his step-children, and the other three his own), and to himself, while yet alive. ['It is noteworthy that the two step-children are here called *θρεπτοί*, which is usually applied to foundlings (*Cities and Bishopr. of Phr.* pp. 147, 350, 546), and they are mentioned before his own.' W. M. R.].

1. εἴδρυσε = ἵδρυσε, cf. Meisterhans, *gramm. der att. Inschriften*, p. 24 (ed. 1). 2. Ἐλπίζων 'διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην. ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς Ep. Col. i. 5' shows the inscription to be Christian. Κυρίλλῃ must be scanned Κῠρῐ̆λλῃ, as probably in v. 3, though there two long syllables are wanting, but in v. 5 we must take the word as Κῡρῐ̄λλῃ. 4. Ζωίλῳ must have the ι scanned as long. 5. Τᾰτῐᾰνῇ, cf. Τᾰτῐᾰνός cited in notes to iii. 1, and the numerous exx. of cognate names Τάτα, Ταπᾶς, etc. in P. Kretschmer's *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache* (Gött. 1896), pp. 348-9.
τὸν θεὸν σὺ μὴ ἀδικήσεις is a Christian formula, as is proved by W. M. R. in *Expositor*, 1888 (Oct.), p. 258 (where he has published a translation of this inscription).

['The bad metre in this (and many similar epitaphs) is due, at least in part, to the fact that they were composed of standing formulae which were rudely adapted to suit the names of the persons buried in the grave. Elpizon purchased a tombstone (perhaps in Kotiaion, the nearest large city). It did not exactly suit him, for it was adorned with a relief representing only two children and one grown up person; but it was probably the most suitable that was ready in the stock of the mason's (or artist's) yard. He took a stock epitaph in metre and turned it to his own purposes. It enabled him to give the names only of two of his five children or step-children, Zoilos and Tatiane, and he added the names of the other three (who were all daughters) on the margin of the stone. It would appear that the name Tatiane was given both to one of his own daughters and to one of his step-daughters. His only son Zoilos married Kyrilla (who bears the same name as Elpizon's wife). Both Kyrilla and Kyrillos were adopted as common names in Christian use, though occasionally employed by pagans.' W. M. R.]

A. Souter.

Caius College, Cambridge.

(*To be continued.*)

NOTES ON GREEK GRAMMAR.

I. *A use of ἐγώ.*

In this *Review*, vol. x., no. 8, p. 381, Prof. Arthur Platt asks whether in Greek the pronoun must be expressed when the representative first person singular, 'I' = 'anybody you like,' is employed, as in Dem. *Phil.* iii. 17; [Xen.] *Resp. Ath.* i. 11; ii. 11, 12. This usage runs the risk of seeming egotistic, and there is in it a familiar, or at least a free and easy tone that naturally tends to restrict it to conversation; but it does not appear that the usage is, as Prof. Platt says, 'excessively rare' in Greek. The Greeks seem to have used it with considerable freedom in dialogue, and occasionally in other compositions of a didactic nature. To judge from Jowett's translation of Plato, we use it more frequently than the Greeks did; but this may well be due to the greater need for it in a less inflected language; for, as will appear, this 'I' is often used for the sake of perspicuity.

Though the answer about to be made to the special question propounded is not absolutely conclusive, it is hoped that the facts contributed will not be without interest on their own account.

It seems best to restrict the question to the nominative case. The oblique cases have to be expressed if they are needed at the first occurrence of this use of the first singular in a given passage; otherwise the first singular would not appear at all. The only question with regard to them would be whether the strong forms are necessarily used; and this is answered in the negative

by the first example from the *Resp. Ath.* cited above. This fact, however, does not show that the nom. may be omitted; for ἐγώ sometimes has less emphasis than ἐμοῦ, ἐμοί, ἐμέ ever have except with prepositions. Moreover, as intimated by Prof. Platt, we must not be misled by emphasis that exists on other accounts. It will be found that when 'I' is thus used, there is generally a contrast with some other person or persons. From such examples, of course, no inference can be drawn. When there is no other cause for emphasis, the suggestion of Dr. Jackson, reported by Prof. Platt, that 'I' means 'I, for instance' and so might lead to the use of ἐγώ, seems sound. The nature of the stress on ἐγώ is made clear by [Plat.] *Just.* 374 E, ὀφθαλμὸν ἐγὼ ἔχω δεξιὸν καὶ ἀρίστερον ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι ἄνθρωποι; Now we give the pronoun three modes of utterance: the *emphatic*, marked by various cadences; the *distinct*, but without special cadence; the *obscure*, the diphthongal character almost vanishing. The Greeks used ἐγώ regularly for the English emphatic 'I,' often for the distinct, sometimes even for the obscure. In no example that I can invent, would the representative 'I' bear the obscure utterance. Hence it would not be surprising if the Greeks settled into the fixed habit of expressing the pronoun. But the question certainly cannot be answered affirmatively on *à priori* principles. The apostle Paul (*Gal.* ii. 18) at once confronts us with εἰ γὰρ ἃ κατέλυσα ταῦτα πάλιν οἰκοδομῶ, παραβάτην ἐμαυτὸν συνιστάνω. Also (1 *Cor.* xiii. 1 ff.), ἐὰν ταῖς γλώσσαις τῶν ἀνθρώπων λαλῶ κτέ.,— thirteen verbs without ἐγώ once. A scholiast (Westphal's *Aristoxenus*, vol. ii., p. 23, § 55, c) says concerning musical intervals: ἐπὶ τοῦ ιβ ἂν διέλθω τὸν ιβ εἰς γ.δ καὶ πάλιν τὸν αὐτὸν ιβ εις γ.δ, ἐν μὲν τῇ εἰς γ.δ διαιρέσει γίγνονται τέτταρες τριάδες. Of course these examples are not conclusive for the classical usage; but where Paul omits ἐγώ we cannot say *à priori* that Plato must have used it.

The examples I have collected are not intended to be exhaustive, but are only such as I could recall or find by a brief search. The subject is hardly of sufficient general importance to justify an irksome mechanical persual of all the Greek authors. The only *certain* example I can now add from the orators is Dem. xxiii. 55, where, after remarking that the law exculpates one who has by mistake slain a friend in battle, the speaker adds καλῶς· εἰ γὰρ ἐγώ τινα τῶν ἐναντίων οἰηθεὶς εἶναι διέφθειρα, οὐ δίκην ὑπέχειν ἀλλὰ συγγνώμης τυχεῖν δίκαιός εἰμι. Here we have the slayer and the slain, two pronouns side by side, hence a rhetorical contrast, and no inference can be drawn. The omission of ἐγώ in the apodosis we should in any case expect. This contrast, actual or formal, is nearly always present. The very object of this use of 'I' is often to avoid the obscurity resulting from the use of two or more indefinite pronouns. Accordingly we sometimes find ἐγώ and σύ instead of τις and ἕτερός τις, where Aristotle would use A and B, as we sometimes do; for instance, Plat. *Crat.* 385 D (after τις has threatened to cause obscurity) οὐ γὰρ ἔχω ἔγωγε ὀνόματος ἄλλην ὀρθότητα ἢ ταύτην, ἐμοὶ μὲν ἕτερον εἶναι καλεῖν ἑκάστῳ ὄνομα ὃ ἐγὼ ἐθέμην, σοὶ δὲ ἕτερον ὃ ἂν σύ. Similarly 386 A, οἷα μὲν ἂν ἐμοὶ φαίνηται τὰ πράγματα εἶναι, τοιαῦτα μέν ἐστιν ἐμοί, οἷα δὲ σοὶ τοιαῦτα δ' αὖ σοί, and nearly the same words *Theaet.* 152 A. Again, *Crat.* 434 E, ἄλλο τι λέγεις τὸ ἔθος ἢ ὅτι ἐγώ, ὅταν τοῦτο φθέγγωμαι, διανοοῦμαι ἐκεῖνο, σὺ δὲ γιγνώσκεις ὅτι ἐκεῖνο διανοοῦμαι; See also *Gorg.* 469 D, *Hipp. Maj.* 300 D, 303 B, *Legg.* iv. 719 D, xi. 913 A. In *Crat.* 385 A the contrast is between ἐγώ and everybody else: ἐὰν ἐγὼ τοῦτο ἵππον προσαγορεύω ὃ νῦν καλοῦμεν ἄνθρωπον κτέ. In *Phileb.* 14 D a man as *one* is contrasted with himself as *many*: ἆρ' οὖν λέγεις, ὅταν τις ἐμὲ φῇ, Πρώταρχον, ἕνα γεγονότα φύσει, πολλοὺς εἶναι πάλιν τοὺς ἐμὲ κτέ. (where there is also formal contrast between 'some one' and 'me'). Sometimes the contrast is between more than two persons, as *Theaet.* 191 B (which may not be a real example); 192 D, ἐγὼ εἰδὼς Θεόδωρον...καὶ Θεαίτητον κτέ. If any one will read rapidly the page preceding the last example, he will feel the need of a concrete case and will probably find it natural to read ἐγώ with some emphasis, although, since the other two men are introduced as objects of perception and knowledge rather than as persons, the contrast is not very marked.

Between the last example and the end of 193 are numerous instances of the omission of ἐγώ. So just after *Crat.* 434 E (quoted above), ἐγώ is omitted. Also *Theaet.* 159 C we find Ὅταν δὴ οἶνον πίνω ὑγιαίνων, ἡδύς μοι φαίνεται καὶ γλυκύς; Ναί. But further on (160 A, C) the emphatic forms are again required to express contrast. These facts appear at first sight to prove that ἐγώ was expressed or omitted just as under ordinary circumstances; but there is a flaw in the evidence. It is a principle of Greek, as of other languages, that when a situation has

been assumed as a basis of discussion, it may be treated as if it were actual. Now in *Theaet.* 192 B ff., the representative ἐγώ has been introduced, and this prepares the way for the omission of ἐγώ just as it does for the use of obscure 'I' in English. Likewise in 159 C, not only has ἐγώ been used, but Socrates has, in B, explicitly made himself and Theaetetus representative persons. There is omission of ἐγώ also in *Phaed.* 99 A, εἰ δέ τις λέγοι ὅτι ἀνεῦ τοῦ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἔχειν, καὶ ὀστᾶ καὶ νεῦρα καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα ἔχω, οὐκ ἂν οἷός τ' εἴην κτέ.; but the example is weakened by the fact that Socrates is making his *actual situation* a representative case. In *Theaet.* 155 B, ὅταν φῶμεν ἐμὲ σοῦ μείζω εἶναι, then in C εἰ μὴ γὰρ δὴ ὁ πρότερον οὐκ ἦ, the acc. ἐμέ (necessarily emphatic because of contrast with σοῦ) has introduced the illustration. Other analogous examples might be cited. The following, if it is an example at all, as I am inclined to think it is, furnishes a clear instance of the omission of ἐγώ: *Parmen.* 143 C, Ἔστιν οὐσίαν εἰπεῖν; Ἔστιν. Καὶ αὖθις εἰπεῖν ἕν; Καὶ τοῦτο. Ἆρ' οὐχ ἑκάτερον αὐτῶν εἴρηται; Ναί. Τί δ' ὅταν εἶπω οὐσία καὶ ἕν, ἆρ' οὐκ ἀμφοτέρω; Πάνυ γε. Οὐκοῦν καὶ ἐὰν οὐσία τε καὶ ἕτερόν τε καὶ ἕν, καὶ οὕτω πανταχῶς ἑφ' ἑκάστου ἄμφω λέγω; The use of εἴρηται renders it possible that Socrates has glided into the *actual* situation when he says ὅταν εἶπω. In Aeschin *Ctes.* § 21, an objector is supposed to say ὅτι ἦρξα μὴ ἀποδημήσω; 'Because I obtained an office am I not to go abroad?' Here ἐγώ is omitted; but it is possible that the orator conceives of an *office-holder* making the objection.

Although no perfectly convincing proof has been produced for classical Greek, still the facts cited taken all together leave little doubt in my mind that it was, under favourable circumstances, allowable to omit the pronoun. I am convinced that the sentence of the scholiast quoted above might have been written by Plato, and it is possible that he did write such a sentence when he made Socrates say ὅταν εἶπω οὐσία καὶ ἕν.

II. *A use of* καί.

Prof. Platt also calls attention to the use of καὶ...δὲ καί in Xen. *Oec.* vii. 21, and μὲν καὶ...δὲ καί in Thuc. i. 126 *ad fin.*, remarking that he does not remember to have seen it noticed anywhere. The usage is not entirely neglected by grammarians. Krüger, for instance, *Sprachlehre* § 69, 32, 15, mentions ὁ μὲν καὶ...ὁ δὲ καί and refers to his commentary on Thuc. vii. 12, 1; 85, 4; viii. 47, 2; but the most he does at any of these places is to refer back to his grammar. Once when collecting evidence that πολλοὶ καὶ ἄλλοι always means '*also* many others' (see *Class. Rev.* vol. v., no. 9, p. 431), I had occasion to examine this phenomenon, but did not publish the results. Perhaps it will not be useless to do so now.

It is always best to dispense, if we can, with English renderings and try to view questions of this sort from the Greek standpoint. No matter how we should render the particles nor whether we can render them at all, it may safely be assumed that the Greeks never connected a pair of words or clauses simultaneously by means of *two* conjunctions felt as such. The general statement, then, of the phenomenon under discussion would be: When one clause is connected with another, two καί's referring to each other may occur, one in each clause, even when the second clause contains δέ; or, if we assume (as we safely may for the classical period) that the δέ of the second clause is connective, we can make a more comprehensive statement including cases where δέ does not occur: Two mutual καί's may occur in two clauses already connected with each other. In the passage quoted by Prof. Platt from Xenophon, the first καί may be retrospective rather than prospective, so that this may not be a real example; but the phenomenon is not very rare, and it is strange that, on its account, anyone should have condemned the opening lines of Theocritus.

When one of the clauses is subordinate to the other, we can feel the force of 'also' in each clause, though we do not so use it, as Dem. lii. 2, δέομαι οὖν ὑμῶν, εἴπερ τι καὶ ἄλλο πώποτε πρᾶγμα αὐτὸ καθ' αὑτὸ ἐδικάσατε ...οὕτω καὶ νῦν διαγνῶναι. 'I beseech you, if you ever judged also another matter on its own merits, so to render your decision also on this occasion.' Xen. *Conviv.* ii. 6, εἴπερ τι καὶ ἄλλο καὶ τοῦτο μαθητόν. 'If also any other thing, this also is learnable.' This use of καί...καί is familiar to beginners; but it does not seem certain that the Greeks felt any difference between it and the one under consideration, though the nearer we come to co-ordination the more unnatural appears our 'also...also,' as is seen in such familiar examples as Andoc. *Myst.* 140, συμφοραὶ μὲν γὰρ ἤδη καὶ ἄλλοις πολλοῖς ἐγένοντο οὐκ ἐλάττονες ἢ καὶ ἡμῖν (in which a relative is felt after ἤ). Aeschin. *F.L.* 41, 25, ὥσπερ καὶ τῆς κατηγορίας ἠκούσατε...οὕτω

καὶ τῆς ἀπολογίας εὐτάκτως ἀκούσατε. [Plat.] *Alcib.* i. 110 D, ἔμαθον καὶ ἐγὼ ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι. Xen. *Cyrop.* viii. 2. 5, ὥσπερ γὰρ καὶ αἱ ἄλλαι τέχναι ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν ἐξειργασμέναι εἰσί, κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ τὰ παρὰ βασιλεῖ σῖτα ἐκπεποίηται. i. 6. 3, εἰκότως ἂν καὶ παρὰ θεῶν πρακτικώτερος εἴη ὥσπερ καὶ ἀνθρώπων. Entering the field of complete co-ordination, where 'also...also' is hardly bearable, we find, as in the examples cited by Prof. Platt and by Krüger, Plat. *Phaed.* 61 E, ἤδη γὰρ ἔγωγε καὶ Φιλολάου ἤκουσα...ἤδη δὲ καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν. [Plat.] Ἀλκυών iii., συχνὰ μὲν καὶ δι' ἀπορίαν, συχνὰ δὲ καὶ διὰ νηπιότητα φρενῶν. Analogous is καὶ...καὶ—δέ, as Dem. vii. 5, τῶν καὶ πρὶν ὑπεσχημένων καὶ νῦν δὲ πραττόντων. For τε...δὲ καί and τε...καὶ—δέ, see below. (These combinations appear to have led some to believe that in such expressions as καὶ στρατηγὸν δέ, it is δέ that means 'also.') The second καί, just as when one of the clauses is subordinate, may be omitted, as Plat. *Theaet.* 142 B, χαλεπῶς μὲν γὰρ ἔχει καὶ ὑπὸ τραυμάτων τινῶν, μᾶλλον μὴν αὐτὸν αἱρεῖ τὸ νόσημα. Or the second καί may immediately precede some other word closely connected with the emphatic one, as Plat. *Menon* 94 E, ἴσως μὲν καὶ ἐν ἄλλῃ πόλει ῥᾴδιόν ἐστι κακῶς ποιεῖν ἀνθρώπους ἢ εὖ, ἐν τῇδε δὲ καὶ πάνυ. Examples containing πολλοὶ καὶ ἄλλοι (where καί is certainly not like that in πολλοὶ καὶ καλοί) exhibit, of course, the same varieties, as Aeschin. *Tim.* 15, 25, κατὰ πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄλλα, οὐχ ἥκιστα δὲ καὶ κατὰ ταῦτα. Xen. *Conviv.* ii. 9, ἐν πολλοις μέν, ὦ ἄνδρες, καὶ ἄλλοις δῆλον, καὶ ἐν οἷς δὲ ἡ παῖς ποιεῖ. *Anab.* vi. 4. 4, ξύλα δὲ πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄλλα, πάνυ δὲ πολλὰ καὶ καλὰ ναυπηγήσιμα (second καί omitted). So Plat. *Parmen.* 133 B, πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄλλα, μέγιστον δὲ τόδε (where μέγιστον renders καί needless). Aeschin. *Tim.* 6, 38, πολλὰ πὲν οὖν καὶ ἄλλα καταγέλαστα πέπρακται...ἓν δὲ ὃ καὶ διηγήσασθαι ὑμῖν βούλομαι (second καί shifted). Here καταγέλαστα, like ναυπηγήσιμα a few lines above, has no καί connecting it with πολλά.

It is also a significant fact that the negative of καὶ...καὶ—δέ is not οὔτε...οὔτε—δέ, but οὐδὲ..οὐδὲ—δέ, as Xen. *Anab.* i. 8. 20, καὶ οὐδὲν μέντοι οὐδὲ τοῦτον παθεῖν ἔφασαν, οὐδ' ἄλλος δὲ ἔπαθεν οὐδεὶς οὐδέν, showing that the negative of the first καὶ is felt rather as our 'also not' than as our 'neither.' So Isaeus iii. 50, οἶμαι δὲ οὐδ' ἂν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐκεῖνον οὐδ' ἄλλον δὲ κτέ. (where some write δῆ, others γε, against the MSS.). In like manner the first καί may become οὐδέ when the second is omitted, as Xen. *Cyrop.* vii. 2. 20, τοῦτον μὲν οὐδ' αὐτὸς δύναμαι περιγενέσθαι, ἀλλ' εἰμὶ ἄπληστος κἀγὼ ὥσπερ οἱ ἄλλοι. Here καί before ἐγώ is the affirmative of οὐδέ before αὐτός, and the ὥσπερ clause has no καὶ as it might have.

Taking into consideration all the facts adduced, we are justified in believing that to the Greek mind καὶ...καί in co-ordinate clauses connected by δέ was not essentially different from καὶ...καί where one clause is subordinate to the other.

There is a usage which at first glance might seem to militate against this view, though in fact it rather lends additional support. I refer to the fact that we sometimes find, not καί but τε in the first clause, followed by δὲ καί and καὶ—δέ, as Plat. *Euthyphro* 3 E, σύ τε κατὰ νοῦν ἀγωνιεῖ τὴν δίκην, οἶμαι δὲ καὶ ἐμὲ τὴν ἐμήν. Xen. *Cyrop.* v. 3. 40, οἵ τε ἄρχοντες καὶ πάντες δὲ οἱ σωφρονοῦντες. The combination τε...καί, it is true, cannot be used when one clause is subordinated to the other; but this is for the simple reason that prospective τε is of the nature of prospective μέν to a sufficient degree to require a corresponding retrospective conjunction or conscious asyndeton, so that when the clauses are co-ordinate we not rarely find τε...δέ where there is no καί and no question of καί, and consequently there can be no obstacle to the insertion of 'also' or 'even'; so that in τε...δὲ καί it is δέ and not καί that is paired with τε.

Prof. Platt elsewhere in his article points out the fact that τε or καί, meaning 'both,' may be followed by asyndeton. This is the view I have always taken of the passages he cites. In my edition of the *Antigone* τε is omitted in v. 673, but the note on v. 296 is: 'καί, *both*. The asyndeton of the next two clauses, with the subject (τόδε after τοῦτο as in 673) repeated, keeps up the force of the series which καί introduces.' To the same effect Prof. D'Ooge on v. 673: 'πόλεις τε: as though καί or τε were to follow. So καί in 296.'

Milton W. Humphreys.

University of Virginia.

THE 'DATIVE' OF THE POSSESSOR.

THE pages of Homer abound in constructions like δεινὼ δέ οἱ ὄσσε φάανθεν (*Il.* 1, 200), just as Vergil is very fond of non unquam gravis aere domum *mihi dextra* redibat (*Ecl.* 1, 35), and the like. These uses are generally explained as simply developments of the dative case: they are given as a branch of the *Ethic* dative (or dative of the person interested), or as a branch of the dativus *commodi* (or dative of the person benefited). But it must be clear that *the exact present meaning* of most of these uses is not adequately conveyed by these abstract expressions. The assumption that the writer, in using this case rather than the genitive of the possessor, intended to denote either that the man was *interested in*, or that he was *benefited by*, his eyes or his hand or his mind or his words or his mother or his horses, is surely untenable: the best translations render them as simple possessives, and such I believe to be not only their exact present meaning in most instances, but also their earliest known meaning in such contexts: it would, I believe, be a great relief to the conscientious translator if he could safely regard the cases in such contexts as simple possessives throughout their known history.

In examining the instances one cannot help noticing how many of them are *pronouns:* and I shall try to show that, at any rate in pronouns, *the Indo-European case in -i had, among other uses, a use as a simple possessive.*

To begin with *Sanskrit*, we find *the dative case*[1] used of the goal of motion, whether that goal be place (this is not very common) or an action: we also find it used of the result etc. (cp. the Latin predicative dative, to some extent), and with certain verbs like to give, to pay reverence, to offer salutation, to send, to give a message, etc., where we sometimes use the preposition 'to.' But I do not know of any instance where it is used in a phrase at all corresponding to Homer's ὄσσε δέ οἱ (above).

On the other hand we *do* find that certain *pronouns* have *an enclitic form* which is *sometimes genitive* (*possessive, etc.*) *and sometimes dative* (*vide the above uses*). The forms *mē* and *tē* would probably have been once identical with μοι and τοι.

Now if we supposed that such forms as these (cp. οἱ above, σοι, Latin mī,[2] illī, eī, nullī, etc.) had in early times not only a dative use, but also a possessive use (which was not derived from this dative use), we should have a reasonable explanation of the existence of forms like μοι, σοι, τοι *in Homer, and* forms like mī, illī, eī, nullī, etc. *in early Latin* (*e.g.* Plautus and Terence), *with both genitive and dative uses.* For the existence of a single form of a pronoun with two or more case-meanings, of which no single one is likely to have given rise to the other two, cp. *e.g.* the Sanskrit uses of the enclitic *nāu* and *vām* as genitive and dative and accusative in the dual, and *nas* and *vas* as the same cases in the plural. Cp. also certain Homeric uses of the *-φι-* case as an instrumental, locative, dative, ablative, and genitive. (Monro, p. 148 foll.).

It seems far easier to suppose that such a wide range of meanings was the result of a still wider range of meanings being confined to certain channels than that it was the result of a single definite case-meaning.

What happened to these forms in later language?

(i.) The pronouns were still used not only as datives, but also as (chiefly possessive) genitives *in poetry*, where there is a tendency to preserve old constructions (cp. the survival in poetry of simple cases, without prepositions, expressing the country in or from which—a construction common in early language).

(ii.) This use of pronouns which were *like 'datives' in form, and were not only 'datives' but also possessives in meaning*, sometimes led to a use of nouns which were 'datives' in form, not only as 'datives' but also as possessives in meaning. It is held by many that certain nouns derived their forms for the nominative plural (*e.g.* οἶκοι vīcī) and genitive plural (*e.g.* vīcōrum) from the pronouns. The use of 'dative' forms of nouns with possessive as well as 'dative' meanings is found in Homeric uses like Ἕκτορι θυμός, and in Vergilian datives like ardet apex capitī (*Aen.* 10, 270), and in uses in Cicero's *Letters* like *Cūriōnī nostrō tribūnātus conglaciat* (*ad Fam.* 8, 6). Without attempting to deny for a moment that many classical uses not unlike this may have been derived wholly or partly from the dative meanings,

[1] By this I mean the dative which once probably ended in *-ai* (cp. δοῦν-αι dar-ei → dar-ī).

[2] mī might have had a double origin, being also descended from mihi (cp. nihil → nīl).

and without attempting to deny that the classical dative in many such uses conveyed a different shade of meaning from the classical genitive, I would only suggest here that the possessive use would help to account for certain instances of Ethic datives like laudāvit mihi frātrem.

(iii.) But as a rule such pronoun-forms came to be regarded more and more as datives, and the uses of μοι etc. became more and more datival, more and more like the uses of *e.g.* ἀνθρώπῳ in their range.

As evidence that Greek did sometimes regard the forms like μοι not merely as possessives, etc., but even as actual genitives, it will be sufficient here to mention instances like μοι...ἀνδρὸς δυστήνοιο (*Od.* 11, 75), etc., and the regular Thessalian use of -οι forms as genitives.

EUSTACE H. MILES.

CONTESTED ETYMOLOGIES.

(*Continued from* p. 94.)

VIII.—SANSKRIT *víçva* 'ALL.'

§ 1. A. Kuhn (*K.Z.* 2, 272) compared ἴσος 'equal,' deriving *víçva* from *víç* 'folk': '*víçva* ist das ihnen zukommende, gemeinsame, daher im griechischen worte der begriff der gleichheit und ähnlichkeit.'

Comparison with Lith. *visas* 'all' tantalizingly suggests itself. The phonetics, if normal, would require **viszva*, cf. *aszvà*: Sk. *áçvā* 'mare.'

§ 2. There is no cogent proof however of Aryan *viḱvo-* in other languages. Meister (*K.Z.* 31, 309) brings forward Ϝιππίξενος from a tomb at Tanagra, and compares this with the Doric name Βίππος and Sk. *víçva*. Who knows but that Ϝίππος is for *Ϝικπος (cf. αἰ-πόλος 'goat herd' for αἰγ-πόλος), and ultimately akin to Sk. *viç-páti* 'lord of the folk,' or is related with *vip-ra* 'seer' (√*vip* 'tremble')? I compare *vipra-vāhas* (*R.V.*) 'having the gifts of seers' with Ϝιππίξενος 'having seers as guests (?)' In Latin √*vip* appears as *vib-* in *vibrare* 'to make tremble.'[1] With Ϝιππο- we can compare *Vib-ius*, the name of a Roman gens.

§ 3. Looking at Sanskrit alone I would attach *víçva-* directly to *víç* in the sense of the citation from Kuhn given above. I believe however that *víçva* has suffered a popular change from **viṣva*, cf. *viṣvañc*, 'nach beiden (allen) seiten gewandt.' Another effective cause of change in orthography may have been **ça-çvant-* < **sm̥-çvant*.

§ 4. Now if *víçva* is a special abnormality of Indiranic (cf. Avest. *vīspo*) for **viṣvo-* then we may compare Lith. *visas* 'all' and its Balto-Slavic cognates. In Greek (Cretic) ϜίσϜον is apparently cognate from the standpoint of phonetics. As to its signification of 'equal,' this develops very naturally from that of 'to both sides' (cf. Sk. *víṣvañc-*).

§ 5. As I have noted above Sk. *vi-ṣu* is one of the words out of which an Aryan *vī-* 'two' has been inferred. Johannson (*B.B.* 14, 171) extends this stem to **evi* on the basis of Avest. *avi-* and Homeric ἔϊσος and ἐείκοσι. It is perfectly futile to regard Sk. *ví* as an apocopated form for **a/vi*, and compare Avest. *avi*, which corresponds to Sk. *abhí*. That this *avi* is used with the abl. in a separative relation is no argument that it is different from *avi* with the acc. in the approximative relation, for παρά with the gen, and with the acc. shows precisely the same shift in signification. As to ἐ-είκοσι and ἕ-ισος, Curtius (*Grdzg.*[5] p. 581) gives a perfectly satisfactory explanation of the incorrect assumption of ἐ- by analogy before almost any lost digamma. Schulze (*K.Z.* 29, 235) writes in this strain: 'Die fälle der vokalprothese vor digamma wie ἐϜίκοσι, ἕεδνα u. s. f. in diese frage hineinzuziehen ist baare willkür, da wir keinerlei vernünftigen grund haben, die möglichkeit eines solchen ἐ-vorschlages zu leugnen.'[2]

[1] Unless this is a compound of *vi+br-* as I have suggested in *Am. Jr. Phil.* xiii. p. 481.

[2] The statistics of ἔϊσος in Homer yield an interesting result. He uses fourteen times in the *Iliad* as a verse ending ἀσπίδα πάντοσ' ἐίσην, twice ἀσπιδα ...π. ε., and once ἀσπίδι πάντοσ' ἐίσῃ. He further uses νηὸς ἐίσης or δαιτὸς ἐίσης sixteen times (*Iliad* and *Odyssey*) as a verse-close, and δαιτὸς μὲν ἐίσης once (I. 225) not at the end of a verse. There are seventeen other verse-closes of the nom. or acc. plur. of the same paradigms νηῦς ἐίση and δαὶς ἐίση, nine in the *Odyssey* and eight in the *Iliad*. We have at Λ 337 φρένας ἔνδον ἐίσας. On a totally different footing is B 765 σταφύλῃ ἐπὶ νῶτον ἐίσας. There is no valid reason why we should not write πάντοσε ἴσην for the first cases cited. In all the other cases δαιτὸς Ϝίσης, say, could stand instead of ἐίσης. Spondaic verses form, it is known, about four per cent. of Homer's verses. There was a false division of πάντοσε ἴσην to πάντοσ' ἐίσην which never spread beyond the feminine ἐίση, in which Johannson invites us to see a continuation of Aryan **evi*!

§ 6. A word needs to be said of the phonetics of Lith. *visas*, viz :—whether *s* (*ss*, cf. O. Pruss. *wissas*) may represent *sv*. It is certain that this is the normal treatment of initial *sv*. (cf. Osthoff, *Perf.* p. 456), and no example has been cited to disprove the same law for medial *-sv-*. For the phonetics of *ἴσϝος* I refer to Brugmann, *Gr.* i. § 620, 7.

§ 7. It is easy to illustrate the shift of meaning involved in these comparisons. Let us take a sentence 'food was given *to both sides*': this implies that an *equal* supply of food is given to *all* and *each*. Such locutions as German *alle beide*, French *tous deux*, *tous les deux* also warrant this association of ideas.[1]

IX.—Latin *vicissim* 'by turns.'

Here we have, in my opinion, no locative **vic-essi* as some have thought (cf. Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.* p. 556), a form which it would be difficult to account for in Latin. I suggest that what we have is an accus. plur. *vicīs*, corresponding to the adverbial accus. sg. *vicem* (*meam* etc.) 'in my turn' (cf. Cic. *de dom.* 4, 8, and Riemann, *Syntaxe Latine*[2] § 41); to *vicīs* an ending *-im* has been added by analogy with *partim* 'in part.'

X.—*ἀπέλλαι· σηκοί, ἐκκλησίαι, ἀρχαιρεσίαι* (Hesychius).

§ 1. In a review of Savelsberg *de digammo* etc. (*K.Z.* 17, 316) Rödiger writes as follows: 'Dass lakon. *ἄπελλα* (attisch = *ἀλία*) aus *ἀϝελ-* ja, *ἀϝελία* (vgl. *ἀϝολλής*) abzuleiten ist, darf. wohl als sicher angesehen werden.' This sentence, penned before the phonetic laws became inviolable, fairly matches our latter-day positiveness of assertion. Fick (*B.B.* 8, 331) compares *ἀπέλλαι* with *τέλος* 'crowd.' Prellwitz (*Et. Wört.* s.v.) accepts this, deriving our word from *ἀ* cop. + **qelnā*. Normal phonetics would require **ἀτέλλαι*.

§ 2. Now *σηκός* means 'chapel, burial-place,' while *ἐκκλησία* means 'church' or 'congregation.' We may fairly conclude that *ἀπέλλα* means 'burial-place, burial-company.' I propose to connect *ἀπέλλαι* with Lat. *sepelio* 'bury,' and Sk. *saparyati* 'he worships,' used pre-eminently with Agni as its object. Burial is of course an act of worship by a religious assemblage. The Sanskrit stem *sapary-* can hardly come from anything but *sm̥* + √*pṛ* 'fill up,' or from *sm̥* + 2 √*pṛ* 'pass by together.' The Hindu ritual books make it clear that worshipping the gods or the Manes meant filling them up with good things. From Lat. *exsequias ire* we get a clue for *sm̥* + 2 √*pṛ* 'pass along together.' If, however, Sk. *sapary-* belongs with Lat. *sepelio* the *l* of the latter makes for the sense 'fill up, satisfy.' There can be no objection on the phonetic side to comparing *ἀπέλλαι* with Sk. *sapary-*. In Latin we should expect **sempelio*, however. There was in Latin, I suggest, a popular connection between *sepulcrum* 'grave,' and *sēpio* 'hedge in,'[2] cf. Cic. *Tusc.* v. 64; '*sēptum* undique et vestitum vepribus et dumetis indagavi *sepulcrum*.' To this association we might ascribe *sepelio* for **sempelio*.

§ 3. If *sepelio* 'bury' shows an earlier meaning than Sk. *sapary-* 'worship,' possibly the sense of *sm̥* + *pṛ* was originally purely physical and meant 'fill up the earth in the grave.'

XI.—Latin *frequens* 'frequent, crowding.'

§ 1. There are two objections to referring *frequens* to *farcio* 'stuff': 1° *farcio*, *φράσσω* do not show anywhere else a 'velar'—an objection which is not insuperable in my opinion; 2° *frequens senatus* is, according to Curtius (*Grdze.*[5] p. 302) 'a crammed meeting'; therefore we should more naturally expect a past ptc. as in *refertus confertus*.

§ 2. In the reference of *frequens* to *farcio* over-emphasis is laid on the connection of *saepe* with *saepio* 'hedge,'[3] for which the better orthography is *sēpio*. It is much more reasonable to believe that *saepe* 'often' belongs to *semper* 'always.' The relation of meaning is just that shown for the negative of these expressions by the '*never*' and '*hardly ever*' of Pinafore. The nasal that has fallen out before *p* we may ascribe to dialectic phonetics (*e.g.* Umbr. *seples* = Lat. *simpulis*), or to a sporadic phonetic change that was never universalised in Latin. At any rate Latin inscriptions are full of such omissions of the nasals (cf. Seelmann, *Aussprache* 273 sq., 281 sq.), and the same phenomenon is common in Greek, (Brugmann, *Gr. Gram.*[2] p. 40). This probably represents after all a tendency toward a nasalisation of the vowel, particularly in the vulgar pronunciation (cf. Kretschmer, *K.Z.* 29, 438 *sq.*), and *saepe* is probably a

[1] I had a negro man-servant tell me once at a door: 'Mr. Fay, the young ladies *both* of 'em are *all* out.'

[2] For the etymology of *sēpio*, see below xi. § 2.

[3] Wharton (*Et. Lat.* s.vv.) further derives *cunctus* from *cingo* 'gird' (!), and *omnis* from *ob*-in the sense of 'comprehensive,' (!).

vulgar *sẹpe*. That *saepe* and *semper* should be adapted to different meanings was inevitable. The association of **sẹpe* 'often' with *saepes* 'thick-set (hedge)' would not be an improbable result of popular etymology. I suggest that *sēptus* may be a compound of **sem-* and the ptc. *aptus* 'fastened,' cf. *coeptus* from *com* and *aptus*; see below xiii.

§ 3. I therefore have to propose for *frequens* the divisions *fre-quens* 'door-crowding,' or, as we say in English, 'jamb-full.' In this way *-quens* belongs to *πάντ-* 'all' and Sk. *çá-çvant* 'crowding together': √*çū* 'swell out.' I define *fre-quens* 'swelling-out to the door.' This explanation explains the *q*, and also the use of the pres. ptc.

§ 4. I see in *fre-* a quasi-preposition related to *foris* 'outside,' *foras* 'doorwards.' The word *for-is* 'a door' is probably an *i-* stem that has taken the place of a consonant stem, cf. Sk. *dvār-*; while *θύρᾱ* and the adv. *for-as* seem to be transfers to the *a-* declension. The Latin plur. *for-es*, however, (gen. *for-um*) and Sk. *dúr-as* (for **dhur-as*, cf. Brugmann, *Gr.* i. § 480) belong alike to the consonant declension. We may therefore ascribe *fre-quens* to a locative **fri* (>*fre*) *quens* 'swelling to the door.' We might, however, start with **fori-quens* 'crowding the forum.' This would become in composition with *in*, say **infriquens* > **inferquens*, whence, by a metathesis common enough in Latin (cf. *Phyrgio*, *corcotarii*, Plautus, *Aul.* 508, 521, and Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.* pp. 91, 97), *infrequens*.

§ 5. On the side of meaning I would claim that from the phrase *frequens senatus* 'a jamb-full senate' *frequens* was extended to other uses. In Plautus (*Mil.* 594) we seem to have a place where the meaning of *frequens senatus* can be fixed right narrowly:

> nam Palaestrio
> domi nunc apud mest, Sceledrus nunc autemst *foris*:

frequens senatus poterit nunc haberier.

Possibly the point in the use of *frequens* is that when the senate was crowded some were out of the doors, the crowd being too great for the space. This explanation is also borne out by *frequentare* 'visit often,' usually with the object 'house.'

§ 6. Objection is made, I am aware to the equation of *παντ-* in *ἅπαντ-* with Sk. *çvant-* in *çá-çvant*; Prellwitz after accepting this equation under *ἅπας* denies it under *πᾶς*: 'die oben unter *ἅπας* angeführte Gleichung ist unrichtig, da ai. (*i.e.* Sk.) *çáçvant* zu einer √*çaç* gehören muss.' Bréal also rejects this etymology (*Extrait du Journal d. Savants*, Août 1894, p. 10). It is still maintained by Brugmann (*Totalität* p. 27–). Wackernagel also sticks by it (*Altind. Gram.* § 197a). Outside of Sanskrit and Greek this word for 'all' seems also to be found, as Brugmann has pointed out, in Albanian *giθε* 'ganz, jeder.' According to the explanation I have suggested for *fre-quens*, Latin also preserves this word in *-quens*.

§ 7. There would be difficulty in equating *ἅπας* with *çáçvant* if we regarded the inflection as on precisely the same footing, for in that case we must needs have **ἅπων*. The difficulty is resolved by noting that in Sanskrit √*çū* is also treated as **çv ā*: so in Greek the ptc. comes from **kv-ā-* and is on the same footing as *στᾶς*: *ἵ-στᾱ-μι*. In Latin, on the other hand, *-quent-* is the weak stem, corresponding to Sk. (*çá-*)*çvat-*.

§ 8. The root of Sk. √*çū* ‖ *çvā* is very well represented in Latin, not only in *inciens* 'pregnant' (: Grk. *κυέω*, same meaning), but also in *queo* 'be able.' I am aware that Osthoff has lately (*I.F.* vi. 12–) come forward as a champion of the theory that sees in *queo* the relative stem, and compares *οἵός τε εἰμὶ*. 'I am one to'—'am able.' Osthoff lays stress on the entire conformity of *queo* to the type of *eo* in its inflection, and derives from a suffixless locative **qē* + *ire* in the sense of 'turn out, succeed' which he shows to have developed for verbs of motion. Granting all that Osthoff claims for the synonymic differentiation of *possum* and *queo*, granting that *queo* means 'I am in a position to' nothing is disproved for the comparison with √*çū* 'swell': *queo* may have meant, to start with, 'I am increased up to.' No one can deny, on the other hand, considering Grk. *οἵός τε εἰμὶ*, that *queo* may be of relative origin. Still we have in Greek both the relative (*τε*) and its correlative!

§ 9. There are three supposed ways in which *queo* followed the type of *eo* according to Osthoff. 1° Latin *eq-ē-* represents the weak grade of Sk. √*çak* 'be able,' extended by *-ē-*. But *queo* **quēs* **quet* would scarcely have followed the pattern of *eo īs it*, with *eo* as the only point of analogy; 2° *queo* follows *eo* because there was an Aryan **qey-mi* **qey-si* etc. like **ey-mi eysi* etc.—but there is no proof of *qey-mi* etc.; 3° *queo* is a compound of *qu-* + *eo*.

§ 10. I note however that in Sanskrit √*çū* makes a present *çv-aya-ti* 'he is strong.' As to this Osthoff says: "das (*çvayāmi*) nun einmal in seiner Bedeutung nur un-

genügend zu queo stimmen will'; why 'ungenügend'? Does not he himself virtually admit (p. 22) that *valeo* 'be strong' is a practical synonym of *possum*? No one will, I presume, deny that *inciens* 'pregnant' belongs with Grk. κυέω Sk. *çv-aya-ti*. If it is to be explained as to its form we may operate with **inqeyens* > **inciyens* > *inciens*. The assumption that **qéyo*, **qéyes*, **qéyet* gave *qêo*, **qeys*, **qeyt* cannot, I believe, be successfully controverted. The treatment of the Aryan group *-éye-* is not to be regarded as settled by *trēs* 'three' < **treyes*, any more than by the acc. *trīs* < **treyes*, for *trīs* (acc.) may be the normal form and *trēs* (nom.) an analogical form. My explanation of **qéyes* > **qeys* is on precisely the same footing as *aes* 'brass' < **ay(e)s*: Sk. *áyas*. It is a mere question of chronology: did the intervocalic *y* disappear before the loss of the post-tonic vowel? The diphthong of *aes* seems to settle the matter, for inasmuch as Umbrian shows *ăhĕsnes* = Lat. *ahēnis* we have no right to regard Lat. *ae* as a contraction of *a(y)e*, but rather as syncopated from *áy(e.)* This conclusion lacks complete cogency, however, 1° because the question can be raised why syncope did not take place in Italic **áy(e)sno-* as in *áy(e)s* > *aes*; to which it may be relied that syncope in a closed syllable is a different thing from syncope in an open syllable, as in *cŏmpărĭmo* where *ă* is a quasi-syncope at least, but *compressi*: 2° because *aes* may be explained as **ay-s-*, the reduced grade of *ay-es-* (cf. Osthoff, *P-B.B.* 13, 405 Anm.).

§ 11. It is not as difficult, however, as Osthoff seems to think to find reasons why *queo* should fall under the analogy of *eo*, even if *queo* went originally by the second conjugation. The present subjunctives are alike, *queam*, *eam*, and the supines, *itum* and *quitum*, while *nequit* and *ne-queo* are certainly as normal as *it* and *eo*. Who shall say that *quīvi* for *quēvi* is not on the same footing as *lēvi līvi*, or as *fīlius* for *fēlius*? There was, *pace* Osthoff, a distinct parallelism of notions in *queo*, and *eo*, viz. when they were used as auxiliary verbs; I cite from Cato (ap. *Festus*, p. 242, Müller): quod uti prohibitum irem, quod in me esset, meo labori non parsi, where the substitution of *quirem* for *irem* would make no noticeable change in the sense. The Latin grammar specially enjoins upon us that for verbs that form no fut. infin. pass. in supine + *iri*, we are to use *posse*. This ground for an analogy between *queo* and *eo* certainly does not exist in the case of *fleo*, *neo*, *-pleo*. These verbs were held in place by *flē-tus*, *nē-men*, *plē-nus*, but even so we have *nit* and *neunt* from *neo*, and these are usually explained as analogical with *it* and *eunt* (cf. Löwe, *Prodromus*, 409 and Stolz, *Gram.*[2] § 100),

§ 12. So far as I can see it makes little difference which of the etymologies shall finally prevail, but Osthoff does not seem to me to strengthen the claims of kinship with the relative by his explanation from **qē* + *eo*: suffixless locatives like **qē* are very much in the air for Latin. Besides οἷός τε εἰμὶ never gave rise in Greek to a verb **τημι* 'I am able.'

XII.—Greek ὄαρ 'Wife': Latin *soror* 'Sister.'

§ 1. It is a commonplace of Latin phonetics that *swe-* gives *so-*. This is inferred from *somnus* 'sleep' beside ON *svefer*. There is no proof however that this does not come from **swopno*, just as Armen. *k'un* (cf. Brugmann, *Gr.* ii. § 66), Lith. *sāpnas*. Another alleged example is *socer* 'father-in-law': ἑκυρός, but the phonetics of *socer* must be considered liable to infection from *sociare* 'join in marriage.'

§ 2. If these cases do not prove the law Aryan *swe-* > Lat. *so-*, still it must be admitted that *sex* 'six' which is probably from Aryan **sveks* does not disprove it, for the Aryan form seems to have had a doublet **seks*.[1]

§ 3. Now if it is not proved that Aryan *swe-* gives Lat. *so-*, there is no reason why Greek ὄαρ 'wife' is not to be compared with Sk. *svásar* and Lat. *soror*. I assume the primitive paradigm was **svésor*, gen. **svesr-és* (cf. Sk. dat. *svásre*, where the accent has been shifted to suit the nom.). Now if *é* was only a tonic vowel in Aryan, the gen. **sves-r-és* probably gave **svos-r-és* and thus the stem was liable to gradation. In Greek the plur. ὄαρες derives from **svosr̥r-es* > **ὸ-ἀρ-ες* whence **ὄἄρες* > ὄαρες.

There is no difficulty from the meaning of ὄαρ, for Juno, we know, was 'et soror et coniunx.'

§ 4. From *soror*, ὄαρ OBlg. *sestra*, Lith. *sesų* we may ask ourselves whether the Aryan stem was **swesr-* or **sesr-*, with such a variation as seen in Greek τοὶ beside σοὶ <**tvoi*, or in the Aryan pair just treated **sveks*||**seks*. My own belief is that the *w* was parasitic, arising by anticipation from **se-sros* (gen.),

[1] In view of the assimilations seen in Sk. *ṣaṣ*, Lith *szeszì* 'six' the form **ksveks* set down as the oldest Aryan form by Prellwitz (*Et. Wört.* s.v. ἕξ) is to be regarded as a form with assimilated spirant groups reaching back into the primitive period (i.e. **ksveks* is for **sveks*).

where the second syllable must needs be spoken with 'rounding.' Instances of this rounding are Sk. *tvaks-‖taks* 'build,' Aryan **sveks‖seks* 'six,' *tar-* 'pass' (cf. *táras* 'speed') and *tvar-* 'hasten.' The original word for 'sister' I take to have been a reduplicating child word like *mama, papa,* say, **sesa* (cf. Grk. *τέττα* 'papa' for the vowels). This was afterwards brought into relation with the other *r-* stems like *māter* etc., and inflected accordingly.

I can find nothing plausible in Johannson's **s-t-er* 'house' **s-er* 'woman' (: √*es* 'be'?), on which he bases Sk. *svá sara* 'Hürde, Stall' and *svá-sar* 'sister' (*I.F.* 3, 226).

XIII.—*Simpulus simpuvium* 'Sacrificial Vessels.'

In the etymology of *saeptus* suggested above (xi. § 2) I have made use of the preposition **sem-* = Sk. *sa-*. This preposition seems to me also to exist in Latin in the words *sim-pulus* and *sim-puvium*, as well as in *sepelio* (*supra* x. § 2). I would connect *sim-pulus* and *sim-puvium* with Sk. *sam* + *pū* 'cleanse,' used particularly of the soma-preparation, cf. *pŭ-tus* 'clean.' The Latin words are very archaic and of a specially sacrosanct character. *Saeptus* was also a sacred word: uti locus ante eam *aram*... stipitibus robustis *saepiatur*, Inscr. Orell. 642; aediculam, *aram, saeptum*, clusum, vetustate diruta restituit, *ib.* 1515. The sacredness of *sepelio* is also evident. These are the words in which I propose to see the Italic preposition **sem-* cognate with *semol*, *i.e. simul.*

Edwin W. Fay.

Lexington, Va.

NOTE ON *DIDACHE* 1, 2, AND ACTS 15, 20. 29.

It is well known that the precept contained in Matt. 7, 12 and Luke 6, 31 is found in a negative setting in Jewish literature, and especially in the book *Tobit* [ὃ μισεῖς, μηδενὶ ποιήσῃς], and it has been suggested that this is the source from which Διδ. 1, 2 [*πάντα δὲ ὅσα ἐὰν θελήσῃς μὴ γίνεσθαί σοι καὶ συ ἄλλῳ μὴ ποίει*] is derived.

To some extent this must be true. That is to say, no doubt can be entertained that there is a Jewish source, adequately represented by Tobit, both for the negative precept in the Διδ, and also for the positive one in the Gospels (which was perhaps intended to correct the narrow view which the negative saying suggests). But there is also some ground for thinking that two forms of the saying ought to be recognized, and that one of them points to a connection between the Διδ. and the Western text of Acts.

The two forms found are as follows:—

A form.

1. Καὶ ὁ μισεῖς μηδενὶ ποιήσῃς. *Tobit* 4, 15.
2. Τοῦτο βραχέως ἡ γράφη δεδήλωκεν εἰρηκυῖα· ὁ μισεῖς, ἄλλῳ οὐ ποιήσεις. Clem. Al. *Strom.* ii. 23.
3. Ὃ γὰρ μισεῖς σοι γίνεσθαι οὐδὲ ἄλλῳ σὺ ποιήσεις. *Didasc.* iii. 15, and similarly, 1, 1.

B form.

1. Πάντα δὲ ὅσα ἐὰν θελήσῃς μὴ γίνεσθαί σοι καὶ σὺ ἄλλῳ μὴ ποίει. Διδ. 1, 2.

This is also used by the compiler of the *Judicium Petri*:—

Ματθαῖος εἶπεν· πάντα ὅσα μὴ θέλεις σοι γίνεσθαι μηδὲ σὺ ἄλλῳ ποιήσεις.

2. καὶ ὅσα ἂν μὴ θέλωσιν ἑαυτοῖς γενέσθαι ἑτέροις μὴ ποιεῖν. Acts 15, 20 and (29) in Dh$^{l.\,mg.}$ pw^{2} Sah. Iren., Cyprian.

Theophilus may be quoting it loosely in *ad Autol.* vi. 34:—

3. καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἂν μὴ βούληται ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτῷ γίνεσθαι ἵνα μηδὲ ἄλλῳ ποίῃ.

A conflation of the *A* and *B* forms is found in the Apostolical Constitutions:—

πᾶν ὁ μὴ θέλεις γενέσθαι σοι τοῦτο ἄλλῳ οὐ ποιήσεις, τοῦτ' ἐστιν· ὃ σὺ μισεῖς ἄλλῳ οὐ ποιήσεις. *Const.* vii. 1.

It is clear that the evidence for the *B* form is really reducible to the Διδαχὴ and the Western text of Acts. It seems improbable that two writers should corrupt the older and terser *A* form in the same way, and therefore it is more than possible that

there is a connection between the two documents. But the evidence does not seem to show whether the Western Acts used the Διδαχὴ, or the Διδαχὴ the Western Acts. The case for the former theory is that the Διδαχὴ, or rather the ground-document (which we may call the 'Two ways'), was current in Syria before the end of the first century; and that the Western reviser, though later than this, was, according to Prof. Ramsay, well acquainted with Syria. Or, if we accept Prof. Blass' view, and consider the Western text to be the earlier form of the Acts, it is easy to understand that, in writing to proselytes, the Apostles would quote what was quite probably a Jewish text-book for proselytes.

On the other hand, the latter theory (that the Διδαχὴ uses the Western Acts) assumes Blass' view;[1] but certainly it gives a good explanation of the genesis of the *B* form.

We know that Hillel used the *A* form, and added that it contained the Law and the Prophets. Now in Matt. 7, 12 the second clause is *οὗτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται*, which seems to connect our Lord's saying with Hillel's, and so with the *A* form beyond all doubt.

[1] It would make the theory of the dependence of the Διδαχὴ on the Western Acts far easier, and perhaps render the assumption of Blass' view unnecessary, if we thought that the absence of this passage in Barnabas pointed to its absence in the 'Two Ways.'

At the same time the first clause in Matt. [*πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἐὰν θέλητε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς*] gives the characteristic phraseology of the *B* form, which therefore probably shows a reaction of the Evangelical wording on a Christian form of the negative saying. The *B* form therefore is Christian, and although it is certainly possible that the genesis of it is due to the earliest Christian redaction of the Διδαχὴ, it seems somewhat more probable that it is to be traced to the Acts, as it is almost incredible that St. Luke would wrest from its setting a saying of this kind and insert it into the Apostolic letter.

It is impossible to quote in support of this view the fact that the eucharistic part of the Διδαχὴ agrees with the Western[2] text of the third gospel, as this part probably belongs to a different stratum of the Διδαχὴ; but it certainly gives rise to the suspicion that the Διδαχὴ spent the early days of its growth in a locality which favoured the Western text.

In any case it seems highly probable that the chronological order of the *A* form, *B* form, and the Evangelical setting, is

1. Negative setting *A* form.
2. Evangelical positive setting.
3. Negative setting *B* form.

K. Lake.

[2] The fact that the Western reading in St. Luke is probably a 'non-interpolation' according to W.H. has also an obvious bearing on the subject.

DIAERESIS AT EVERY FOOT IN LATIN HEXAMETER, PHALAECEAN AND CHOLIAMBIC VERSE.

Verses in which the word-foot coincides largely or throughout with the verse-foot are rough and produce a prosaic effect. The classical writers generally avoided them. Yet such verses occur more frequently in Latin than is generally supposed.

I. In the *Hexameter*, e.g., as far as is known, but three examples have been cited, and all of these from one poet, Ennius, (cf. Luc. Mueller, *Re Metr.*[2] p. 218; Gleditsch, *Metrik d. Röm.* p. 173; Christ, *Metr. d. Gr. u. Röm.* § 220; Plessis, *Métrique Grec. et Lat.* § 24). To these three the following should be added:

A. Martial (*Gilbert*):—

(1) III., 76, 3:

Hic, rogo, non furor est, non haec est mentula demens?

(2) V., 82, 3:

An potes et non vis? Rogo, non est turpius istud?

(3) VI., 40, 3:

Haec erit hoc quod tu; tu non potes esse quod haec est.

(4) VI., 60, 9:

Nescio quid plus est, quod donat saecula chartis;

(5) X., 73, 9 :

Munere sed plus est et nomine gratius ipso.

(6) XI., 32, 1 :

Nec toga nec focus est nec tritus cimice lectus.

(7) XII., 6, 11 :

Non licet et fas est. Sed tu sub principe duro.

B. Ovid :—

(8) *Epist.* XV., 309 :

Ut te nec mea vox nec te meus incitet ardor,

(9) *Remed. Am.* 283 :

Hic amor et pax est, in qua male vulneror una,

(10) *Remed. Am.* 481 :

Nam si rex ego sum, nec mecum dormiat ulla,

(11) *Trist.* II., 195 :

Longius hac nihil est, nisi tantum frigus et hostis,

(12) *Trist.* IV., 4, 75 :

Nec tamen hunc sua mors, nec mors sua terruit illum :

(13) *Trist.* V., 5, 21 :

Quatenus et non est in caro coniuge felix,

C. Juvencus :—

(14) I. 352 :

Nunc sine, nam decet hoc, sic sancta per omnia nobis.

D. Carmina Epigraphica (*Buecheler*).

(15) 461, 1 :

Suetrius Hermes hic situs est, cui Tertia coniunx.

(16) 720, 12 :

Omnibus his mox est de flammis tollere flammas.

E. Anthologia Latina (*B. et R.*)

(17) I., 1^2 (p. 89), 21, 110 :

Haec labor haec ars est, hinc fulvum colligis aurum !

(18) I., 1^2 (p. 244), 286, 297 :

Cernere iam fas est, quod vix tibi credere fas est.

(19) II., 1 (p. 30), 486, 60 :

Angulus ut par sit quem claudit linea triplex,

(20) II., 1 (p. 38), 489, 1 :

Omnia sunt bona : sunt, quia tu, bonus, omnia condis.

(21) II., 1 (p. 39), 489, 4 :

Omnia nam, quae sunt, a te sunt, te sine nil est.

(22) II., 1 (p. 39), 489, 5 :

His sine tu, simul es pro cunctis his et in illis.

(23) II., 1 (p. 39), 489, 6 :

His sine tu, quod es, es ; non hi sunt te sine quod sunt.

(24) II., 1 (p. 39), 489, 7 :

Ac nec id hi quod tu, nec tu quod hi, sed in illis.

(notice in (18) lengthening of quod by *h* following)

(25) II., 1 (p. 163), 716, 10 :

Audit quod non vult, qui pergit dicere quod vult.

It will be noticed that 17 out of the 25 have some form of *esse* in the arsis of the 3rd foot and that 11 of these have *est ;* that some verses are almost entirely composed of monosyllabic words notably No. 18.

If verses in which elision occurs (as II., 1 (p. 40), 489, 47 : At deus esse habet, etc.) were taken into consideration the above number would be considerably increased.

II. *Phalaecean.*—This variety of verse occurs in greatest numbers in Martial and Sidonius, 2048 in the former (not 2054, as Meyer gives it, *Sitzungsber., d. phil. class. der Akad. d. Wiss. zu München*, 1889, p. 208), and 1234 in the latter. Catullus ranks third with 495. In Martial, and also in Catullus, verses with a break at the end of every foot occur more frequently than is generally stated. Leutsch, *Philol.* X., 740, says that in Martial such verses are 'höchst selten.' Paukstadt, referring to the same poet, says, *De Mart. Catulli Imit.*, p. 29, that they occur but once (V., 20, 9), basing the statement upon the results of Leutsch's investigation. Friedlaender, *Martial*, I., p. 29, says, verses like V., 20, 9 occur 'sehr selten.' But at least 15 such verses occur in that poet :

(1) II., 4, 5 :

Quare non iuvat hoc quod estis esse ?

(2) II., 37, 1 :

Quidquid ponitur hinc et inde verris,

(3) III., 73, 2 :
Et non stat tibi, Phoebe, quod stat illis,

(4) IV., 30, 5 :
Illam, qua nihil est in orbe maius,

(5) V., 20, 9 :
Campus, porticus, umbra, virgo, thermae,

(6) V., 24, 15 :
Hermes omnia solus et ter unus.

(7) VI., 17, 3 :
Tu si Furius ante dictus esses,

(8) VIII., 64, 17 :
Uno iam tibi non sat est in anno,

(9) VIII., 76, 7 :
Vero verius ergo quid sit, audi :

(10) X., 49, 4 :
Quisquam plumbea vina vult in auro ?

(11) X., 72, 4 :
Iam non est locus hac in urbe vobis ;

(12) XI., 75, 2 :
Tecum, Caelia, servus ; ut quid, oro.

(13) XII., 18, 14 :
Quem nec tertia saepe rumpit hora,

(14) XII., 34, 5 :
Et si calculus omnis huc et illuc

(15) XII. 75, 4 :
Mollis Dindymus est, sed esse non vult ;

A similar state of affairs exists in Catullus. Leutsch says such verses occur in that poet but once, namely in 42, 2 ; Paukstadt says only twice, adding the example 2, 9. This latter statement is adopted by Riese in his edition of *Catullus*, But five more cases occur in that poet :

(1) 5, 7 :
Da mi basia mille, deinde centum,

(2) 26, 1 :
Furi villula vestra non ad Austri

(3) 40, 6 :
Quid vis ? qua libet esse notus optas ?

(4) 42, 3 :
Iocum me putat esse moecha turpis

(It will be noticed that 42, 2 was cited but the line just below it was overlooked).

(5) 58, 1 :
Caeli, Lesbia nostra, Lesbia illa.

Elsewhere 6 other examples have been noticed :

(1) Priapea, 77, 8 (B.) :
Ergo qui prius usque et usque_et usque

(2) Lampridius, p. 381 (Baehr. Frag.) :
Pulchrum quod vides esse nostrum regem,

(3) Lampridius, p. 382 (Baehr. Frag.) :
Pulchrum quod putas esse uestrum regem

(4) Prud., Peristeph. VI., 155 :
Blandum littoris extet inde murmur,

(5) Anthol., Lat. I., 1^2, 444, 2 :
Quam vos creditis esse, vita ; non est.

(6) Terent. Maur. 2548 (K.) :
Namque et iugiter usu saepe Sappho.

Meyer omits from his list of 5356 phalaecean verses the Priapea, 288 ; he says there are 175 in the Anthol. Lat. There are in all 213 (I. 1, has 168, II. 1, has 45). It may be noted also that Martial's ' Cäsurlose' verses are 1 in 15 according to Meyer's own statistics, instead of 1 in 12, the number which he gives.

Friedländer, *Mart.* I., p. 29, also says that in Martial verses with a break at the end of each of the first 3 feet as in II., 6, 11 are very rare. At least 88 such verses occur : 8 in Bk. I., 6 in II., 2 in III., 8 in IV., 4 in V., 8 in VI., 12 in VII., 3 in IX., 11 in X., 10 in XI. and 16 in XII. With diaeresis at the end of each of the last 3 feet, 16 verses occur in Martial.

III. *Choliambic.*—As verses in this metre are much fewer in number compared with either of the other two kinds, fewer cases of diaeresis, of course, occur. I have found but one example and that in Catullus, 44, 21 :

Qui tunc vocat me cum malum librum legi.

None occurs in Martial, though a number are found with a break at the end of each of the first 4 feet or of each of the last 4 feet.

It is believed that in the case of the Phalaecean and Choliambic metres, the above list is complete, and that in the Hexameter there cannot, at least, be many more examples than those above cited.

EMORY B. LEASE.
University of Michigan.

THE FOURTH THESIS OF THE HOMERIC HEXAMETER.

The law that lengthening by position is forbidden in this part of the verse, was formulated by Wernicke in his edition of Tryphiodoros (an epic poet of the school of Nonnos), see Schulze *Quaestiones Epicae*, p. 423, and Giseke, *Homerische Forschungen*, p. 146. Lists of exceptions are given by Hartel, *Hom. Studien*, I² 87, Hilberg, *Princip der Silbenwägung*, p. 112 (though he does not acknowledge its validity for Homer, Hesiod, the Cyclic poets, Theognis, Simonides, Archestratus, Matron, and Theocritus), Giseke, *l.l.* p. 149 (instances for Iliad only): Schulze *l.l.* gives references to Gerhard, *Lectiones Apollonianae*, p. 148 and Nauck, *Mélanges gréco-romains* iv. 646. On *-ν ἐφ.* forming position in thesis, see Buth, *Philol.* xxxix. Schulze points out that verses such as λ 629 (*τὸ πρόσθεν*) and such combinations as *σὺν νηὶ μελαίνῃ* are lawful.

I cannot understand why it should be very difficult to break the law. If one reads modern Greek hexameters, and then considers how very few exceptions are to be found among the 27,803 verses of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, one will hardly be inclined to agree with the view that it is all a matter of accident. For instance, aorists of the form *τάνυσσαν* are common enough, and would follow very conveniently after the weak caesura in the third foot, as in *Dublin Translations*, p. 163,

οἵ ῥ' ἤτοι κατὰ ἶσα τάνυσσαν φύλοπιν αἰνήν

(a line which to my own ear sounds quite correct) but according to Giseke's list the whole *Iliad* does not supply a nearer parallel, than

Σ 400 *χάλκεον δαίδαλα πολλά.*

According to Giseke the *Iliad* in its 15,693 verses contains only 13 instances, including some repetitions, of a polysyllable so scanned before a non-enclitic word.

Mr. Agar's conjectures should show Prof. Tyrrell that he overrated the difficulty of violating the rule in question. Though *ϝ* rarely forms position in thesis, and though *Iliad* and *Odyssey* together supply only two instances (M 55, ω 240) of *-ν ἐφ.* forming position in the 4th thesis, Mr. Agar proposes

δίωκεν ϝοῖο δόμοιο,
σκῆπτρ' ἦρχεν ϝεἰπέ τε μῦθον.

Pape-Benseler, *Gr. Eigenn.*, have failed to notice that 'the name of the river was Titaresus,' and instead of *ἀλύσκανε* χ 330 being 'Wolf's reading for *ἀλύσκαζε*' the latter word is the reading of two MSS. only F Z, whereas all the rest and Apollonius Sophistes show *ἀλύσκανε*.

Whatever the truth about P 387, the context (*ὀρώρει, νωλεμὲς αἰεί*) makes an aorist very improbable.

As to the starting point of the discussion

H. Dem. 269
ἀθανάτοις θνητοῖσιν ὄνειαρ καὶ χάρμα τέτυκται,

I have not studied the hymn sufficiently to have any right to an opinion. Schulze, *Qu. Ep.* p. 228 accepts *ὄνεαρ* <*ὄνηαρ*, like *φρέαρ* <**φρῆαρ* (Hom. *φρείατα*). In view however of *ἦρος* v. 455 and *φρεᾶτι* or *φρεᾰτι* v. 99, it is hard to decide between *ὄνεαρ* and *ὄνειαρ*. It must be borne in mind that the *-ει-* is not diphthongal.

The reason for the limitation on lengthening by position in the 4th thesis, is the pause at the end of the fourth foot, according to Giseke, *H.F.* p. 146. It seems to me, however, that a pause rather assists lengthening than otherwise, and I should like to make the following suggestion. Lengthening by position of close vowels at the end of polysyllables is forbidden in the fifth thesis, and is exceedingly rare in the fourth; it is rare in the second and not very common in the first. But in these positions there is no such marked repugnance to lengthening by position within words. I conjecture that this points to the final consonants being shorter than the same sounds within words; I think one may notice the same thing in German. To me at least the nasal in -nd- sounds longer in 'ein wohlhabender Mann' than in 'wir haben das Buch.' Thus the *-αντ-* may have been really shorter in *ἔδειμαν τεῖχος* than in *δείμαντος*. But even the second syllable of *δείμαντος* must have been somewhat short of the full length of a thesis, viz. *two* short syllables, and *ἔδειμαν τεῖχος* was quite appreciably shorter. Hence such collocations were avoided in thesis. But altogether avoided they could not be, least of all in the first half of the verse. For the beginning of the sentence generally coincided with

the beginning of the line, and many common words had to be placed early in the sentence and, therefore, in the line. On these see Wackernagel, *Indogermanische Forschungen* I. p. 333, and Monro, *H.G.*[2] p. 335.

In the arsis, on the other hand, such lengthenings were much less objectionable, since there the standard was only *one* long syllable, and a long syllable is shorter than two short ones, *i.e.* the arsis is really shorter than the thesis. Hence the comparative frequency of short syllables doing duty in arsis, whereas they very rarely form a thesis. Indeed the chief restriction on their appearance in arsis is that the arsis must be the first or last syllable in a 'phrase,' to use a musical term. Perhaps the hexameter originated in a $\frac{3}{4}$ measure.

C. M. Mulvany.

The rule, or so-called rule, in the Greek hexameter, that a syllable naturally short cannot be lengthened by position in the thesis of the fourth foot, is by no means a recent invention. It is at least as old as Gerhard, who in his *Lectiones Apollonianae*, published in 1816,—in which he has done some good service to the text of Apollonius Rhodius—says (p. 147) that a spondee made such by position is avoided in the fourth foot, and he proceeds to give a reason, or what may pass as such, for the rule. His words are, 'neque solum si interpunctio fuit, sed etiam si gravitas quaedam numerorum apta videbatur, separato utebantur spondeo in quarta sede. Ut autem vere contineret vocem celerius currentem, gravi sua vi spondeus fiebat, non potuit sua vi vocem continere, sed properandum erat, ut fieret spondeus. Igitur vitabant spondeum externa vi, hoc est positione, effectum'—a fantastic reason enough. In consequence of this rule Gerhard in *Ap. Rh.* iii. 517

ὦρτο μέγα φρονέων, ἐπὶ δ' υἷες Τυνδαρέοιο

altered υἷες to ὑιεῖς, though the latter is a form not used by Apollonius. Again in iv. 978 he read

εἰδόμεναι χρυσέοισι κεράασι κυδιάασκον

where the codd. have χρυσέοισι κεράεσσι. Brunck had here corrected to χρυσέοις κεράεσσιν with position made by ν ἐφελκυστικόν. Wellauer (1828) on *Ap. Rh.* iii. 517, while recognising the rule, at the same time points out several violations of it in Homer and keeps υἷες, but he follows Gerhard in iv. 978. In iii. 517 Köchly (1850) conjectured υἷέε and is followed by Merkel. Rzach in his *Grammatische Studien zu Apollonios Rhodios*, (1878) follows Wellauer in keeping the text in this passage on the ground of the Homeric exceptions, and in iv. 978 follows Brunck. It is clear then that this rule is acknowledged by German scholars or they would have felt no difficulty in retaining υἷες.

Whether such a rule is to be recognized or not is a question on which I express no opinion. It depends of course upon what proportion the exceptions bear to the examples. Mr. Agar has quoted many exceptions in Homer, and there are others which he has not referred to, viz. H 337, K 389, ω 240. However I quite agree with him that later Epic poets have observed metrical practices to which Homer does not conform, and to them this particular one may have been a rule. Thus there is only one more violation of the rule in Apollonius, besides the two I have named.

The limitation about the monosyllable, and when the consonant or consonants lengthening it are in the same word, is a refinement not mentioned by Gerhard or Wellauer. Perhaps this has been added by Hilberg, but I have not seen what he has written.

R. C. Seaton.

I feel very glad to have raised this question, as it seems likely now to get itself settled one way or the other. For myself I remain obstinate to all the arguments of Prof. Tyrrell and Mr. Agar, charm they never so wisely. And especially in regard to the *Hymns*; indeed it was in the *Hymns* that I said such licenses must not be admitted. Let us first settle the line that gave rise to all this tempest, *Hymn Dem.* 269. It must be admitted that there is no other violation of Hilberg's law in this hymn nor in any other with the exception of the two limping lines I quoted in my first note on the subject, both of them from quite short and worthless hymns and both atrociously bad lines. Are we then justified in introducing a solitary example into a hymn which, if nowhere very poetical, is at least very carefully versified? I hardly think many people will disagree with me in saying No, and I say it though I confess myself much tempted by Mr. Agar's restoration and should think his a very probable account of the corruption were there no metrical objection.

Now let us turn to the wider question. This is not, *pace* Prof. Tyrrell, 'Can a short

vowel resist position?' I protest that neither Hilberg nor I nor any one else ever said anything of the kind, and I wonder Prof. Tyrrell can accuse a respectable father of a family of such a thing. To put it better than I did before, I say that in a certain part of the line vowels naturally short are hardly ever found in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and practically not at all in later poets of any respectable skill, and among these later poets are the authors of the Homeric Hymns, but not Hesiod. To say that a short vowel can resist position would be to say that the syllable containing it can be scanned as a short syllable despite position.

But Prof. Tyrrell says this is not a law but a coincidence. He has by this time doubtless read Mr. Agar on the same subject; does he still think it is all the result of accident? Why, so natural is it that Mr. Agar wants to introduce it into more than twenty passages of Homer besides the dozen or so where we already have it. And then 'the spondee in the bucolic diaeresis is very rare,' and in fact there are so few of them that you would not expect any of them to have the last syllable naturally short. Why, there are at least twenty-five lines in the first book of the *Iliad*, after deducting every case where there can be any shadow of doubt, in which a hypermonosyllable with the last syllable naturally long precedes the diaeresis; say six hundred in the whole epic, and that is really much understated, I imagine; and there are somewhere about eight in the whole *Iliad* which offend against the law, and only two in the *Odyssey!* Is it chance that not one in a hundred of such words ends in a syllable naturally short? Thirdly 'the law rests on no principle but only what Bacon calls *nuda enumeratio*.' No principle I know of, be it so, but I do not know on what principle the law about the weak caesura in the fourth foot rests, or the law about the cretic in trimeters, or the law which forbids a molossus to stand before the diaeresis, or the law which makes a molossus with the first syllable resolved in the same position so rare in Homer, and so exceedingly rare in later epic writers that I believe there are only two instances of it in all Quintus Smyrnaeus, and not even one in Apollonius. Those laws also were arrived at by *nuda enumeratio*.

But my feelings carry me away; let us end in amity. For before taking leave of Prof. Tyrrell I should like to say that there is at least one person who believes as firmly in his ἔσσο at *Hermes* 33 as he can himself, nor is it the only conjecture of his upon the Hymns which appears to me admirable.

Mr. Agar, as I have already had occasion to observe, takes up a very different standpoint. Admitting that violation of the law is excessively rare in our texts, he puts this down to the credit of late editors and would re-introduce it freely. I confess that I do not know whether he can be driven from this position, if he will modify the statement a little, though I by no means think him right. If he will modify, for as I understand him it was the critics contemporary with the later poets, as Apollonius,[1] who were the culprits. But by the time of Apollonius the text of Homer was practically fixed. Who then were they and of what age? Of the age of the Hymns, or somewhere between them and Apollonius? But until that is settled it is of no use to pursue the question further. And whoever they were, why did they not correct all that host of far more glaring metrical absurdities? Why did they leave ἠῶ δῖαν and φίλε ἑκυρὲ δεινός τε and the rest of them? Why, if they were about correcting this obscure detail at all, did they not correct Λ 796 and Π 38 from ἅμα δ' ἄλλος to ἄλλος δ' ἅμα? I don't believe the early Greeks purposely altered Homer at all; they looked on him as Dryden did on Chaucer, a prodigious genius of an unpolished age who never had the advantage of sitting at the feet of Mr. Waller.

Aristarchus either knew nothing of the rule, a hardly probable supposition when poets before and after him observe it, or flew in the face of it when he read μέλαιναν at Φ 126. To be sure he was caught in a cleft stick, for had he read μελαίνῃ he elided the dative φριχὶ to which he may have objected still more.

There is no time now at any rate to discuss all the interesting suggestions of Mr. Agar at η 114 and elsewhere, for many of which there does certainly appear a great deal to be said, if he can establish his main theorem, but I cannot withhold my tribute of admiration for the celerity with which he has built and launched a new theory while I was looking round me, and the energy with which he has ransacked Homer to produce examples for my overthrow.[2]

[1] Apollonius himself of course obeys the Homeric law, allowing such lengthening in the case of monosyllables.

[2] I thought Mr. Agar would score a point off me for accepting Bentley's παρέσταν at Η 467. I did so with the greatest hesitation and I now think I was wrong.

My own collections on the subject appear to have 'taken their endless way to the winds' twelve quarters,' but as well as I can remember he has not missed a single instance, despite his apologetic 'there may be more.' Assuming these then to be all the Homeric instances to be had, let us examine them a little more closely, taking what is at present the orthodox view.

It is always a safe rule in dealing with any Homeric question to take Grote's advice and begin with the *Odyssey*. And from the *Odyssey* what do we learn? As Mr. Agar rightly hints, we are to read *περίφρων* for *περίφρον* in the lines ending *περίφρον Πηνελόπεια* (compare *περίφρων Εὐρύκλεια* as a vocative). Then we have only two exceptions in 12,000 lines and these two are:

λ 338: *ξεῖνος δ' αὖτ' ἐμός ἐστιν· ἕκαστος δ' ἔμμορε τιμῆς.*
ζ 93: *αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πλῦνάν τε κάθηράν τε ῥύπα πάντα.*

Observe that in these two lines the law is hardly broken, if at all. For in the former it is not simply *ἕκαστος* but *ἕκαστος δ'* that precedes the diaeresis, and in the latter *κάθηράν τε* is practically one word as *τε* is enclitic. But admit them to be exceptions in the fullest sense; then you have one exception to every 6,000 lines, and if that does not prove a rule, what does? By the time the *Odyssey* was composed therefore the rule already was in force, and *à fortiori* it prevailed in the *Hymns*.

Did it then in the *Iliad*? Nine examples are quoted by Mr. Agar, but from what time do they date? That is the worst of it, one is sure to stumble sooner or later upon this accursed 'Homeric question.' But one thing is at once obvious from his list; three of them are out of the Catalogue. Removing these we have six in about 15,000 lines, a much higher proportion than in the *Odyssey*. Moreover three of the six are from the *Achilleid* according to Dr. Leaf. But look again at these six. O 189 is *ἕκαστος δ' ἔμμορε τιμῆς* over again, Λ 189, 796, Π 38 (the three Achillean examples) are all practically identical, *τὸν δ' ἄλλον λαὸν ἀνώχθω, ἅμα δ' ἄλλος, ἅμα δ' ἄλλον.* Σ 400 is a bad line, for *χάλκευον* breaks two laws at once. Μ 20 is *Κάρησός τε Ῥοδίος τε*, where again we find the enclitic *τε* as also in one of the Catalogue instances. The three best cases then are the Achillean, and how is it that all three are one formula? Mr. Agar will say 'because an old formulaic line may be expected to exhibit no consciousness of any such rule,' and I daresay he may be right. But to go no further into this matter, was I not justified in saying that the instances are too few and too uncertain to warrant us in introducing another into a hymn in which there are none at all?

However I return to the Catalogue. This is allowed to be connected with the Boeotian school, and so with Hesiod. It is interesting therefore to observe that Hesiod and the Catalogue are the strongholds in which the impugners of the law can best find refuge. Look at *Theogony* 287, 325, 339, 340, *Shield* 395, *Works* 721, 778, *frag.* (Rzach) 25, 148 (?), 155.

In no hexameters later than this is the law not observed so far as I know. Even works so bad in technique as the Orphic *Argonautica* obey it. The case of Quintus Smyrnaeus is perhaps as instructive as any can be; in the Tauchnitz edition you will find four violations, ii. 206, x. 73, xii. 314, xiv. 443 (besides xii. 65 where the offending word is only a monosyllable and has been long ago corrected). Two of the four are emendations! Another was corrected by Wernicke, who is followed by Spitzner, Lehrs, Köchly and Zimmermann, and in the latter's text there now remains only one. And this in an author whose versification is not very delicate, and who, whatever Zimmermann may say, is anything but '*Ὁμηρικώτατος* rebus metricis.'

Finally *βοῶπις πότνια Ἥρη*. If Mr. Agar will look at Mr. Monro's *Homeric Grammar* § 116, he will see that the evidence for the long *ī* is quite independent of Hilberg's law, though of course this law in its turn reinforces the argument that the last syllable was long by nature. But *γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη*? Well, I infer that that was a later phrase. And indeed when I look at that *βοῶπις πότνια Ἥρη* with its long *ī*, and the long *ā* of *πότνια*, and the ancient religious significance of *βοῶπις*, I feel as if it were a fossil of some unknown creature that calls up visions of a whole vanished world. There it lies embedded in strata who knows how many centuries later, speaking of generation after generation of poets already using the hexameter and preparing the path for the rising of the *Achilleid* with that glorious exordium which remains the highest of all preludes as it is the first we know, *ὡς πυρὸς αἰθομένου ἢ ἠελίου ἀνίοντος*.

ARTHUR PLATT.

THE PYLOS AND SPHACTERIA QUESTION.

I VERY much doubt whether the controversy between Mr. Burrows and myself can be of very engrossing interest to the world in general. Still I should wish, if the editor of the *Classical Review* will allow me, to correct one or two errors which Mr. Burrows has made in his lengthy and somewhat polemical criticism of my paper, and also to repudiate the meanings which he has been kind enough to attribute to certain statements of mine.

In the first place I suspected when I read Mr. Burrows' original contribution to the *Hellenic Journal* that he was inclined to give to topography in relation to Ancient History an emphasis far greater than that which I should be disposed to allot to it. That it may contribute largely to our knowledge of the subject I, of course, believe; otherwise I should not give time and trouble to it: but I am also persuaded that the conclusions to be drawn from it cannot be by any means so detailed as some of those which Mr. Burrows has drawn from the evidence he obtained at Pylos, and are subject to far stricter limitations than those which he would assign to them. Mr. Burrows would like to separate the topographical from the historical evidence, and is apparently quite angry with me for not adopting this excellent but wholly impracticable plan. For instance, with reference to my estimate of the former breadth of the entrance from the bay into the lagoon he says '(Mr. Grundy) has placed the western end of the sandbar where he places it, for no other reason than because such a state of things fits in with his preconceived theory as to the Spartan defence of the harbour, and is not incompatible with the geological probabilities.'

This is a form of accusation to which any comparison between topography and history must expose the maker. At the same time had Mr. Burrows read more carefully the paper which he criticises he would have seen:—

(1) That the breadth I have allotted to the channel is only put forward as a very approximate estimate.

(2) That the so-called preconceived theory is founded on the whole story as given by Thucydides and not merely on those detached fragments of it on which Mr. Burrows appears to rely.

Throughout the whole of his paper Mr. Burrows seems to think that I put forward my conclusions as though I considered them to be fully ascertained. In this he is mistaken. Still had he seemed to me to give a correct representation of the evidence I adduced, I should have been quite willing to let the original papers and the replies stand. As it is I am unwilling to allow readers of the *Classical Review*, who may not have seen the *Hellenic Journal*, to suppose that I made use of the sort of argument which Mr. Burrows attributes to me.

I. *The Final Struggle on Sphacteria.*

Mr. Burrows is glad to see that I have considerably altered my position with regard to the Spartan defence of the summit of the Island. I cannot understand what gives him this impression. I hold and have always held since I saw the ground that the Spartans were posted round the summit on the arc of a segment somewhat greater perhaps than a semicircle, of which the cliff from the summit into the little hollow formed the straight side, and that along the main cliff, into this hollow, and up this small cliff the Messenians made their way. As to the actual path by which they arrived at the hollow, I have already said that it is ultra-refinement of topography to attempt to indicate it in detail, and have pointed out that Mr. Burrows' theory involves a supposition directly at variance with the account given by Thucydides. Mr. Burrows gets over the difficulty by supposing a path from the Panagia along the foot of the cliffs, no trace of even the possibility of which can be shown at the present day.

I need hardly say that the remark of Mr. Tozer to which he refers is nothing more than the suggestion of a possibility.

I confess that I am wholly unable to determine the exact position which Mr. Burrows would assign to the Spartans: but, as far as I can make out, he seems to think that they were in occupation of the little hollow from the very first beginning of the fight at the summit, or, at any rate, were defending the northern outlet of it.[1]

I can only say that, if this fairly represents Mr. Burrows' view, I do not see how in that case the first few Messenians could have arrived at the south end of the little hollow without being immediately discovered

[1] *J.H.S.* 60, 61.

and cut down by the Spartan troops stationed in it. There could at any rate have been no fatal surprise.

I incline to the view that it was from the south end of the hollow that the Messenians arrived, but I think that Thucydides' story of the surprise becomes quite inexplicable if there were any Spartan troops in the hollow itself. The rational explanation seems to be that in all probability the Spartans at the summit had good reason to suppose that no one could get into it undiscovered, and that therefore any possible attack from this very difficult side could be easily warded off by lining the low cliff, should the necessity for so doing arise. What the Messenians apparently did was to get into it unobserved, by some wholly unsuspected way, and hence they succeeded in gaining the actual summit by scaling the low cliff before the Spartans could provide for its defence.

As to the *παλαιὸν ἔρυμα*, I have accepted Mr. Burrows' re-identification of Dr. Schliemann's discovery, and I have never had any doubt as to its having stood on the site indicated, Thucydides' evidence on this point being peculiarly clear. At the same time I shall retain my caution with regard to the care which must be exercised in drawing distinction between certain kinds of rock formation existent on Sphacteria and the earliest examples of wall work.

A fair example of the misunderstanding of my views which is so unfortunately frequent in Mr. Burrows' paper is afforded by his reference to the supposed remains on Hagio Nikolo. Mr. Burrows speaks of 'the Nestorian remains which he (Mr. Grundy) claims to have discovered on Hagio Nikolo.' The addition of the word 'Nestorian' begs the question. I never made such a claim. I said expressly that 'there cannot be any certainty about the site until excavation has been done.' [1]

II. *The S.E. Corner of Pylos.*

I have read Mr. Burrows' argument on this point carefully several times, and I confess I do not wholly understand its constructive side; so I will simply deal with it in so far as it is destructive.

Referring to the south end of the east cliff of Pylos, Mr. Burrows says [2] 'the rise of the ground at any rate never approaches the perpendicular,' a statement which he supports by an extremely disparaging reference to the illustration which he inserted with his own paper. He does not even do his illustra- justice. He says that in it 'the sandbar is regarded as non-existent,' [3] whereas the beginning of it is plainly shown on the right edge of the picture in the form of a light patch in the engraving. I do not know, of course, what Mr. Burrows means by 'never approaching the perpendicular.' I see that at this south end of the east cliff, the summit of the cliff rises to a vertical height of 60 feet above its eastern foot, which is only at a horizontal distance of 81 feet from that summit. This slope moreover is not continuous, but in part much steeper than that implied by these general measurements; in fact, if I recollect aright, the lower part is perpendicular cliff, with a slope from the top of the cliff to the 60 ft. level. Anyone who realises what this really means in nature will understand that Mr. Burrows' remark is highly misleading.

Mr. Burrows then proceeds to talk of survey defeating its own object if it supersedes observation.[4] Is he under the impression that surveying instruments act automatically? Is he not aware that a survey implies an enormous series of observations which have to be made with the greatest care, since one error may mean the loss of a day's work? Is he aware that every change of slope requires a new reading of the angle for contouring purposes? How can survey supersede observation, when it is itself nothing else save the record of observation aided by instruments of accuracy?

As to the path round the south end of the cliff, Mr. Burrows accuses me of forgetfulness as to its existence.[5] The forgetfulness, or rather oversight, is Mr. Burrows' own. I refer to it on p. 17 of my original article in very definite terms.[6] There is just room for the path and nothing more: but in my case, the matter is not of vast importance in view of the evidence of that south part of the east cliff having been washed by the sea in comparatively recent times.[7] This also disposes of the main objection which Mr. Burrows makes as to the position of the south wall of defence as given on my map (wall BB.). As to this wall not having been on the actual shore, the facts given by Thucydides are quite sufficient to show this, viz.

(1) *ἐχώρει ἔξω τοῦ τείχους ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν.*[8]

[1] *J.H.S.* p. 49, *ad fin.*
[2] *C.R.* p. 2.
[3] *C.R.* p. 2, note 6.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 3.
[5] *Ibid.* p. 3.
[6] *J.H.S.* p. 17, also *ibid.* p. 5.
[7] *Ibid.* p. 10.
[8] Thuc. iv. 9, 2.

(2) καὶ τὰς τριηρεῖς αἵπερ ἦσαν αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῶν καταλειφθεισῶν ἀνασπάσας ὑπὸ τὸ τείχισμα προσεσταύρωσε.[1]

We may conjecture, too, from what Thucydides tells us, that Demosthenes never regarded this wall as a really practicable line of defence, and possibly never completed it.

What Mr. Burrows means by an attack by land on the south side of Koryphasion[2] I do not see, except that he seems to postulate the existence of low ground, now the western extremity of the sandbar, to the east of the south end of the east cliffs of Koryphasion.[3] The evidence, in so far as it exists, is all against this postulate.

He is kind enough to present me with an argument against himself. I do not require it. The state of the cliffs and of the sandbar is evidence enough. I dealt with both in my first article.[4]

Mr. Burrows derives an argument from the present position of the emissaries.

In the first place they are all artificial at the present day. In the second place the two he mentions were made through the higher part of the sandbar several hundred yards from Koryphasion, because if made at the lower part of the sandbar close under the cliffs they have a tendency to become choked by the sand from the bank which is forming at the inner end of the Sikia Channel. That is what had happened with regard to the one which is shown on my map running half-way through the sandbar near Koryphasion.

Mr. Burrows fails to understand how Demosthenes could have beached his ships on the south-west shore of Koryphasion. He thinks the statement astounding, and apologises for me by supposing it to be an oversight. And yet Mr. Burrows allows the Peloponnesian vessels to get near enough in shore, even during the stress and confusion of battle, for them to be able to use their ἀποβάθραι. If they could do this under such circumstances, I do not see how it should be so astounding that Demosthenes at certain places on the same stretch of shore should have been able to draw up his vessels when there was no one to hinder him.

Mr. Burrows and I differ as to the place at which the Spartans proposed to attack by engines. He suggests his suppositious slope or low land at the south-east corner of Koryphasion. He imagines that a wall running down to the end of the cliff on the Sikia Channel must have been the proposed object of attack. I have already shown that the existence of the piece of land he postulates is contrary to the evidence obtainable. But suppose that that low land had been in existence, the Peloponnesians could only have got at the last few yards of the wall close to the channel, and had they knocked that down they would only have opened a passage a few yards wide, which a few men could have defended against enormously superior numbers. Surely it would be more natural for them to assail the north wall, which in the position in which I conjecture it to have stood was easily assailable by engines, as Mr. Burrows admits.

I have nothing to add to or to subtract from my explanation of τὸ κατὰ τὸν λιμένα τεῖχος in the *Hellenic Journal*. As to the word ἀπόβασις, Mr. Burrows' criticism is evidently founded mainly on a misreading of what I have said in my original paper.[5]

Turning to the question of the position of the north wall, Mr. Burrows leaves the difference between us in much the same state as it was before. I see, however, that he has considerably modified his views with regard to certain details. In his reply to my criticism, he utterly ignores the two most important factors,

(1) The enormous superiority of the attacking force;

(2) The fact that an attacking party can choose the point of attack.

I am very strongly of opinion that the wall to whose remains he points, was some hurried structure run up in connection with the defence of the summit of Koryphasion, a very different object from the defence of the whole promontory.

On the lagoon question I have nothing to add to what I have already said, save that Mr. Burrows' accusation of an attempt on my part at dating its progress of formation is quite unwarranted by anything I have said on the subject.

Mr. Burrows refers to the modification which I have thought it necessary to make in my view as to the channels which were blocked.[6] I freely admit that I missed in the first instance what seems to me to be the fairly obvious explanation of this very obscure point in a very obscure question. Nor do I think that those who have read Thucydides' narrative very closely, and can form an estimate of the very complicated nature of the factors involved in the

[1] *Ibid.* iv. 9, 1.
[2] *C.R.* p. 3.
[3] *V.* again in *J.H.S.* p. 10.
[4] *J.H.S.* p. 12, *ad fin.*
[5] *Vide. J.H.S.* p. 29, *ad fin.*
[6] *V.* end of this article.

explanation of any part of it, will feel much surprise that I have had in this section to amend the bill. I rejected the original theory on my own criticism of the story as a whole.

But had Mr. Burrows confined himself to re-killing this dead Voithio Kilia theory, he would have avoided a serious error. He proceeds however to attack the amended view that the channels blocked were the entrances into the lagoon harbour, (1) via the outer part of the Sikia Channel from the sea, (2) via the inner part of the same channel from the bay. He says 'If the object of the Spartans was to prevent the Athenians from getting into the inner harbour, why did they not block the mouth of that harbour itself'? etc. He then adds 'But can Mr. Grundy point me out in this case a single advantage'? viz. in the blocking of the two channels, as compared with the blocking of the lagoon entrance. Of course I can, and so can anyone else who reads Thucydides' text. If there is one point with regard to the views of the Spartans on which Thucydides lays peculiar stress it is that they were deeply convinced of the necessity of maintaining the communication with their men on the Island. Had they left the Sikia open, the communication would have been either cut, or rendered very difficult, so soon as the Athenian fleet arrived.[1]

Mr. Burrows argues at considerable length for the superiority of his theory with regard to the channels over my own. According to him the blocking of the harbour entrances was a wild impossibility. Yet Thucydides, as his repeated and detailed assertions show, believed the thing to be possible. All this Mr. Burrows rejects in order to establish a theory founded on the fact that fifty, the number of the Athenian fleet, may be without difficulty divided into two parts having to one another the ratio of two to eight.

He inserts at this point of his argument a note. It is with reference to Thucydides' words ἐν τε τῷ λιμένι οὔσας τὰς ναῦς καὶ οὐκ ἐκπλεούσας.[2] He says :—

'Thuc. iv. 13, 3. Mr. Grundy *J.H.S.* p. 30–32, apparently thinks ἐν τῷ λιμένι refers to the ships blocking the eastern of the two channels. Here, then, even the first informant used λιμήν in a double sense! For these ships were not in the inner harbour.'

Of course they were not. That is exactly the point. But Mr. Burrows has not even taken the trouble to note that I said expressly in dealing with the two divisions of the story, 'The first part . . . closes at the end of the first section of the thirteenth chapter.'[3] Consequently the informant was not the first informant at all but the second.

The other points raised in his article have been discussed in my previous articles, and repetition of the arguments would require more space and time than I have at my disposal.

G. B. Grundy.

I append herewith the revised view as to the blocking of the straits, to which reference is made in Mr. Burrows' paper.

Addendum, October 1896.

The foregoing paper (that in the *J.H.S.* of April 1896) was written eight months ago. It is one thing to reconsider one's views while still in the MS. stage; it is another to examine them when they appear in the cold impersonality of print. The intense complication of the subject made me somewhat anxious as to the result of the latter examination. Having now made it, I may say that I am prepared to abide by all that I have written on the many points of the narrative—with one exception: I should wish to modify the view expressed as to the explanation of the difficulties with regard to the blocking of the channels. Those who have read the paper will see that I believe that there was a solid foundation of actual fact beneath the express statement made on this point by Thucydides. In the paper I have stated my belief that the characteristics of the mouth of the Voithio-Kilia and the Sikia Channel contribute this basis, and that probably both of these were blocked, the latter both inside and out. On reconsideration I would modify this expression of opinion. I am inclined to think that the reasons for blocking the Voithio-Kilia are inadequate, and that, in fact, the blocking of the Sikia inside and out is the true explanation of the difficulty—in other words that the Peloponnesian fleet intended to block the entrance of the Lagoon harbour, which entrance the topographical evidence obtainable on the spot, and given in the paper, shows to have existed in its most recent form at the Pylos end of the sandbar

[1] *J.H.S.* p. 74 etc.
[2] *C.R* p. 9, note 3.
[3] *J.H.S.* p. 42.

right under the south portion of the east cliff of Pylos (now Palaeo-Kastro). The estimate I have formed of the condition of things at the time will be found marked in Plate II. of the maps.

That the blocking of the Sikia was part of the design in the blockade of Pylos I think there can be no doubt. If any one does doubt the fact, let him remove this factor from the problem, and he will then see the enormous mass of difficulties which the removal would involve. Every mistake or difficulty (and there are many of the latter) in Thucydides' account, with the exception of the length attributed to Sphacteria, is ultimately traceable to his failure to recognise the existence of *two* harbours.

PLATO, *SYMPOSIUM*, 179 C.

Although the words that I would endeavour here to correct occupy but a small space, I quote the passage in which they occur (*symp.* 179 B—D) in extenso, in order plainly to show them in their proper connection :—

καὶ μὴν ὑπεραποθνήισκειν γε μόνοι ἐθέλουσιν οἱ ἐρῶντες, οὐ<χ> [μόνον] ὅτι <οἱ> ἄνδρες, ἀλλὰ καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες. τούτου δὲ καὶ ἡ Πελίου θυγάτηρ Ἄλκηστις ἱκανὴν μαρτυρίαν παρέχεται ὑπὲρ τοῦδε τοῦ λόγου εἰς τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐθελήσασα μόνη ὑπὲρ τοῦ αὐτῆς ἀνδρὸς ἀποθανεῖν ὄντων αὐτῶι πατρός τε καὶ μητρός, οὓς ἐκείνη τοσοῦτον ὑπερεβάλετο τῆι φιλίαι διὰ τὸν ἔρωτα ὥστ' ἀποδεῖξαι αὐτοὺς ἀλλοτρίους ὄντας τῶι υἱεῖ καὶ ὀνόματι μόνον προσήκοντας. καὶ τοῦτ' ἐργασαμένη τὸ ἔργον οὕτω καλὸν ἔδοξεν ἐργάσασθαι οὐ μόνον ἀνθρώποις ἀλλὰ καὶ θεοῖς ὥστε πολλῶν πολλὰ καὶ καλὰ ἐργασαμένων εὐαριθμήτοις δή τισιν ἔδοσαν τοῦτο γέρας οἱ θεοί, ἐξ Ἄιδου ἀ ν ι έ ν α ι[1] πάλιν τὴν ψυχήν, ἀλλ' α<ὐ>τ ὴ ν ἐ κ ε ί ν η ν[2] ἀνεῖσαν ἀγασθέντες τῶι ἔργωι· οὕτω καὶ θεοὶ τὴν περὶ τὸν ἔρωτα σπουδήν τε καὶ ἀρετὴν μάλιστα τιμῶσιν. Ὀρφέα δὲ τὸν Οἰάγρου ἀτελῆ ἀπέπεμψαν ἐξ Ἄιδου φάσμα δείξαντες τῆς γυναικὸς ἐφ' ἣν ἦκεν, αὐτὴν δὲ οὐ δόντες, ὅτι μαλθακίζεσθαι ἐδόκει ἅτε ὢν κιθαρωιδὸς καὶ οὐ τολμᾶν ἕνεκα τοῦ ἔρωτος ἀποθνήισκειν ὥσπερ Ἄλκηστις, ἀλλὰ διαμηχανᾶσθαι ζῶν εἰσιέναι εἰς Ἄιδου.

[1] *ἀνεῖναι* MSS., em. Alexander Hommel in ed. Symp. Lipsiae 1834.

[2] *ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐκείνης* MSS. et. edd.

Hommel's correction of *ἀνεῖναι* to *ἀνιέναι*, which had forced itself upon me before I knew that he had made it, seems inevitable; albeit it has met with little or no favour with subsequent editors. The traditional reading is easily explained as due to the following *ἀνεῖσαν*.

As to the change that I would propose the following points must be noticed. First, there is a sharp antithesis implied between *εὐαριθμήτοις*—*ψυχήν* and *αὐτῆς* (following the vulgate)—*τῶι ἔργωι* : secondly, this antithesis is not expressed by the vulgate : thirdly, the position of *τὴν ψυχήν* indicates that in the antithetical clause we should have a term contrasted with it; but *τὴν ἐκείνης* (sc. *ψυχὴν*) will not suffice. We gain help from the story of Orpheus where *φάσμα* and *αὐτή*, 'the real woman herself,' are contrasted. Reading *αὐτὴν ἐκείνην* we have the woman herself as *σῶμα καὶ ψυχή* contrasted with the mere *ψυχή*.

Mortimer Lamson Earle.
Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania.

NOTE ON TERENCE *ADELPHI* LINE 415 (DZIATZKO), AND PLAUTUS *MOSTELLARIA* 805 *SQQ.*

Horace appears to have this passage in mind as he writes *Satire* 1, 4, 105 *sqq.* as noticed by Dz. In *Ep.* 1, 5, 23 he seems to have l. 428 before him. Demea in 415 says, 'I bring up my son to see himself reflected in the light of other people's lives as in a mirror and to take an example from the lives of others.' Syrus parodies this, replacing Demea's lofty abstractions by concrete instances drawn from the repertoire of the cook : 'I tell my fellow slaves that it is their business to mend their ways : and I do this by holding up to them instances of failures or successes in certain dishes which

they have prepared.' But in at least two out of the three epithets employed in l. 425 a *double entente* is plain, 'Hoc salsum est,' This is too salt, and this is a smart stroke (salsum erit quod non insulsum. Cic.) and lautum 'cleaned' and 'refined'—it seems not improbable that some similar double meaning lurks in adustum too.

In Plautus *Mostellaria* 805 *sqq.* the dialogue between Tranio on the one hand and Theopropides and Simo on the other is a sustained series of witty *double ententes.* Tranio points slyly to the old men looking at the house which Theopropides fancies that his son has bought and says:—

Age specta postes quoius modi!
Quanta firmitate facti et quanta crassitudine!

i.e. 'you see these old timber-skulls how hopelessly dense and thick they are.' In 811 Theo. says: 'They are even worse than I took them for.' Tranio. 'How so?' Theo. 'Because they are actually worm-eaten (crazy) already'—ab infumo refers to their gouty feet. 814 means, 'And even now they are sufficiently good-natured for me to take them in if they are only cleverly led on'—'pice' is an *ἀπροσδόκητον. Connivere* is a word meaning to 'adhere closely,' but Tranio means it to be understood by the audience in the sense of 'how they close their eyes!' *Arte* means both *closely* and *by my art.* The difference of quantity in the final *e* does not affect the rhythm.

H. A. Strong.

Liverpool Univ. Coll.

BRENOUS ON HELLENISMS IN LATIN.

Étude sur les Hellénismes dans la Syntaxe Latine, par J. Brenous. Paris, C. Klincksieck. 1895. 8vo. Pp. 445.

This book, dedicated to Max Bonnet, and probably in some degree inspired by him, has found a sympathetic reader in the present reviewer, who himself believes that a strong inductive influence was exerted by the Greek language upon the Latin, and that this influence has been very generally underestimated. The cumulative effect of the evidence here collected is considerable, and the main conclusions are likely to commend themselves to unprejudiced scholars. The author does not hold a brief, nor is he at pains to make out the largest possible number of 'hellénismes.' With admirable candour he considers each case, or alleged case, by itself, and not infrequently renders a decision adverse to the Hellenistic claim. In fact this scrupulous balancing of evidence sometimes makes on the reader the impression of irresolution. We may instance the treatment of the 'dative by attraction' (p. 191).

M. Brenous' attitude toward the main question may be briefly stated as follows. Very few turns of construction are consciously and directly adopted from the Greek. Most Hellenisms are extensions, under Greek influence, of idioms already existing in Latin,—extensions, however, which the language, if left to itself, would probably not have made. We are not sure that the author would admit any downright, unprepared Hellenisms whatsoever. Still we infer from his language that he would recognize as such the genitive without *filius* (*Hasdrubal Gisgonis*), the genitive absolute, the genitive with interjections (*foederis heu taciti*), phrases like *ait fuisse, sensit delapsus, statim* (*εὐθὺς*) *creati, quippe* (*ἅτε*) *reuisens*, and perhaps a few other expressions. But in general he seems almost eagerly solicitous to establish some Latin connexion for each Graecizing phrase. Here and there this zeal has led him further than we can follow. It is not apparent that anything is gained by attaching the palpably Greek expression *est mihi uolenti* to *est mihi gaudio* or to *insperanti mihi accidit.* And is there any real link between the dative with *idem* and the same case with *similis?* Like Madvig and others the author bridges the way to the gerundive of purpose, *Aegyptum proficiscitur cognoscendae antiquitatis*, in which he rightly sees a Greek idiom, by *naues deiciendi operis missae* (Caesar) and *exercitum opprimundae libertatis habet* (Sallust). To us it is not so clear that in these and like expressions the gerundive really belongs with the noun. May not these be the earliest examples of the full-fledged Hellenism? In like manner Brenous' Latin analogies for *cernere erat* (*ἦν ἰδεῖν*) seem very remote.

As further samples of the locutions which M. Brenous refers to Greek influence, may be mentioned the vocative in *seu Iane*

libentius audis, the genitive in *sermonis fallebar, tristitiae dissoluere, regnauit populorum, uacuus caedis, laeta laborum, integer uitae;* the dative in *pugnare puellae, it clamor caelo* (based on the Homeric Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν and the like); the accusative in *tremit artus, currere stadium, Iouem lapidem iurare, seruitutem seruire* (he does not make it quite clear what he thinks of *noxam nocuerunt* in the fetial formula, Liv. ix. 10, 9), *uincere Isthmia, saltare Cyclopa, dulce ridentem, cernis acutum, femur tragula ictus, indutus pallam, suspensi loculos lacerto, inscripti nomina regum, exigor portorium.* Likewise the infinitive in *populare uenimus, egit uisere montes, bibere institutae* (about *dare bibere* he hardly commits himself), *da uirginitate frui;* with *amo* (φιλῶ) in both senses (*tecum uiuere amem* and *perrumpere amat saxa*); in *nobilis superare, fruges consumere nati* (πεφυκότες), *maior uideri* (μέγας ἦν ὁράασθαι, πάσσονα θῆκεν ἰδέσθαι); many uses of the substantive infinitive, as *istud uiuere triste, amasse meum;* furthermore the infinitive in subordinate clauses of indirect discourse. So too the imperfect indicative in *non tu corpus eras* (οὐκ ἄρ' ἦσθα), and the gnomic perfect (*deduxit*, Hor. Epist. i. 2, 48). The author also recognizes the Greek optative as one of several agencies co-operating in the development of the subjunctive of repetition (*si quis...prehenderetur, consensu militum eripiebatur*).

At certain points one might incline to go further than M. Brenous has gone. In discussing the partitive genitive he admits as Graecisms *prima* (τὰ πρῶτα) *uirorum* but not *strata uiarum, sancta dearum* but not *expediti militum.* This may possibly be right, but surely *Phocidis Elatia* does not find its justification, as a pure Latin expression, in Caesar's *Durocortorum Remorum* (p. 102). So in regard to the 'dative of relation' (*oppidum primum uenientibus ab Epiro*) he expresses himself, we think, too timidly. On the other hand, we do not fully share M. Brenous' assurance of Hellenistic influence in the dative of the agent with passive verbs, and we likewise hesitate to ascribe to Greek imitation the indicative in indirect questions, the indicative in subordinate clauses of indirect discourse, and the use of the participle in *-rus* without *est* to express intention. Nor are we yet prepared to see in apodoses such as *poteram*, or *uiceramus* (with following *si nisi*) a reminiscence of the Greek indicative of unreality. The Greek model which the author proposes for phrases like *nominandi istorum copia* is itself a rarity, and the analogy more than doubtful. We fear that the explanation of this puzzling syntax must be sought elsewhere. Still less can we follow M. Brenous in his treatment of the perfect infinitive used for the present. It is a pity that, with his wide reading, he had not known the exhaustive study of this subject by A. A. Howard in the first volume of Harvard Studies, in which the development of this idiom is skilfully traced. His conclusions, we are confident, would have been materially modified. The notion that this perfect infinitive somehow represents the Greek aorist, so that *fecisse* is a clumsy translation—or mistranslation—of ποιῆσαι, has always seemed to us particularly unhappy. Were Roman boys not taught by their Greek masters to distinguish between ποιῆσαι 'to do,' and ποιῆσαι 'to have done'?

In a somewhat elaborate Introduction, M. Brenous undertakes, from the analogy of modern languages, to show the probability *a priori* that Latin would be influenced by Greek in other ways than by mere word-borrowing. He describes the influence of French on German, of English (in Canada) on French, and so on. Of course he is entirely right in this; the wonder is that any one can doubt it. The most superficial observer of modern European languages must know how imitation of the phrases and idioms of another tongue—particularly one of superior culture—has everywhere been a most potent factor. All in their earlier stages have been moulded by the Latin, many by the French. A luculent example is the modern Greek of Athenian newspapers, often little else than a tissue of French and English phrases expressed in Greek words. That Greek, standing in the relation to Latin in which we know it did, should not have influenced Latin similarly, is simply inconceivable. It might be said against M. Brenous that his illustrations from modern languages seldom show changes of formal syntax. In fact he sometimes appears to lose sight of this distinction. But the distinction is after all not essential. The adoption of foreign syntax comes about, if at all, through the adoption of concrete, specific phrases. It is these phrases that are actually borrowed. Ἡδὺ γέλασσαν produced *dulce ridere*, ὀξὺ βλέπειν produced *cernere acutum.* These in turn begot other expressions embodying the new syntactical feature. In ways like this, even syntax may be affected by foreign influences. M. Brenous justly regards the habit of literal translation, in and out of school, as responsible for many of these

borrowings. The Augustan poets, with Livy and Tacitus, betray the strongest Greek influence, but he refuses to concede that even Plautus is entirely free from it.

We must point out, in justice to the author, that notwithstanding the considerable number of idioms in which he detects the imitation of Greek structure, his fundamental principles do not differ much from those held by other recent grammarians. The dictum of Schmalz (Müller's Handbuch ii.^{2} p. 423), 'in allen diesen Konstruktionen hat man demnach keine Gräzismen zu suchen, sondern echt lateinische Wendungen, deren Entstehung sich psychologisch sehr leicht erklären lässt . . . . Dass hiebei die Anklänge an die griechischen Vorbilder mitbestimmend gewesen sein mögen, liegt auf der Hand und kann nicht bestritten werden,' might, barring its contradictory phraseology, almost pass for M. Brenous' own statement. The question of 'Hellenism' is often, we see, one of name rather than of fact. In conclusion let us reaffirm our favourable judgment of this work. The six francs which it costs will be a good outlay for any student of Latin syntax.

F. D. Allen.

Harvard University, August 1896.

THE WORKS OF HIPPOCRATES.

Hippocratis Opera Quae feruntur Omnia. Vol. i. Recensuit Hugo Kuehlewein. (Bibl. Script. Graec. et Rom. Teub.). Lipsiae, Teubner. 1895.

Prolegomena Critica in Hippocratis operum quae etc. (ut sup.). Scripsit Johannes Ilberg. Lipsiae, Teubner. 1894.

Hippocrates, Sammtliche Werke. Ins deutsche uebersezt und ausführlich commentirt von Dr. Robert Fuchs. Erster Band. Munich Lüneburg. 1895. (Pr. M. 8. 50).

Das Hippocrates-Glossar des Erotianos und seine ursprungliche Gestalt. Von Johannes Ilberg, (abhl. d. phil-hist. Classe d. K. Sachs. Ges. d. Wissenschaft). Bd. xiv. Leipzig, Hirzel. 1893.

These important works upon the Hippocratic writings should have been noticed some time ago; to plead that many engagements have prevented me from reading them carefully may serve as an explanation but, I fear, not as an excuse. Some little delay indeed was due to the expectation of a second volume of the editions of Kuehlewein and of Fuchs, as a better judgment may be given upon larger instalments of such works. The first work on the list is a new edition of the Hippocratic scriptures by Kuehlewein; to which are prefixed brief prolegomena by Ilberg and the editor: the second entry on the list is but a separate impression of Ilberg's contribution in pamphlet form. There is room for a new edition of Hippocrates; though perhaps from the linguistic point of view rather than from that of the substance. Before the appearance of Littré's Edition the only one of considerable importance was that of Foesius, which was founded upon Cornarius but very far excelled it. The best edition of Foesius is that of Geneva 1657. Littré brought to the study of these books all that scholarly industry and acuteness, reinforced by the learning of an accomplished physician, could achieve: but Littré did not aim at the production of an edition containing all the various readings of the sources of the text; exact Greek scholarship was not the strong feature of his admirable edition, and his attention was given somewhat exclusively to the beautiful MSS. in Paris.

The volume before me contains the following books:—Περὶ ἀρχαίης ἰητρικῆς, Περὶ ἀέρων ὑδάτων τόπων, Προγνωστικόν, Περὶ διαίτης ὀξέων, Περὶ διαίτης ὀξέων νόθα, Ἐπιδημιῶν Α, Ἐπιδημιῶν Γ.

Kuehlewein's text is founded upon five codices, as follows:—First, the oldest and most precious of the Hippocratic manuscripts, that of Vienna on vellum, of the tenth century. Secondly and about equal to it in importance, the Parisian MS. No. 2253; it is on vellum and of the eleventh century. Thirdly, the Laurentian in Florence, a vellum manuscript of the eleventh to twelfth century, brought from Constantinople. Fourthly, the Marcianum, in St. Mark's at Venice, considered by Daremberg, if I remember a-right, to be of the same family as the Parisian No. 2253; and finally the Vatican MS. No. 276, of the twelfth century, the oldest of those which follow the Marcian. A facsimile of a page of the beautiful Parisian MS. No. 2253 is appended to the prolegomena; it is written in a beautiful

small hand and currently legible even by one so unskilled in palaeography as myself. Omitting the secondary sources, which are carefully set forth by Ilberg, such are the foundations of the present edition. Whether the editor regards it as a complete variorum edition of the great Ionian I scarcely know, as but one volume is before me; in this volume the alternative readings often go beyond the primary sources, and appear to be drawn from a wide comparison of texts. No doubt the editor has used a good deal of discrimination in his notes, and has taken care not to allow any material variations to escape record. This edition of the text then is of great literary importance; forasmuch as the Ionic style of Hippocrates is not that of Herodotus, and his writings, apart from their essential merits, are thus of primary importance in constructing a standard of the Ionic dialect. The editor does not touch upon this interesting subject; probably because he has to restrict his excursus on account of the handy size of his edition. In like manner he has not entered, thus far at any rate, into the difficulties of the canon. For this I can forgive him; as there remains but little to say that has not been said again and again by other commentators. I think that it was Dr. Greenhill who used to tell the story of a certain list which contained those books of the corpus which were regarded by English scholars as the *probably* authentic; but by equally eminent continental scholars as a list of the books certainly *not* by Hippocrates! As matters now stand attributions vary in the mouths of various teachers from a short list of some half dozen books to twice the number. I dare say the contrast could be made even more divergent than this: argument on the subject is virtually exhausted unless some fresh evidence turn up.

On the other hand I think that too much is made of the uncertainty of attributions. Whosoever were the author of this book of the canon or of that, it is clear that all the books are ancient. I do not now refer to Egyptian origins but to Greek work of the great time, and before it. The collection moreover consists almost entirely of Ionic records, though Cnidian books are mixed with Coan: this being so, and for other reasons of an internal as well as of a historical kind, it seems probable that the Hippocratic scriptures may date back as a whole to a time before Aristotle. The canon is almost certainly pre-Alexandrian. Thus although, after the fashion of early times, there are many works in the collection written in the name of the Master, yet there is none which is of the nature of forgery or of pastiche. All of them, whether rough notes or more finished treatises, are serious documents; and the collection is a genuine one throughout. This opinion is founded upon the similarity of dialect pervading the whole corpus, upon the borrowings and quotations which the authors mutually owe to each other, upon the elevation of manners, and upon the clear-sighted aversion from mysticism on the one hand, and from speculative philosophy on the other, which is notable throughout. In some of the books we find a lofty simplicity of style which gives them a place in fine letters; in others the style, rugged in its veracity and directness, still claims a position of its own in literature: nor is this spirit absent from any of the books, though none of them shows any pretentions to literary art, and many indeed are little or nothing more than the notes of disciples. We know but too well how ready medicine has always been, not perhaps to lose its ethical tone, but to fall under the tyranny of formulas, or into the toils of metaphysical systems; but such an 'alacrity of sinking' is not manifest even in the rudest of the Hippocratic books. The editor does not prefix any argument to the several books; a great want in a working edition of the canon: but this edition is evidently intended to be a handy variorum edition for daily use, and all such additional matter is perhaps forbidden. Littré's volumes are much more cumbrous. No more then is provided than the soundest text yet published, with indication of the sources and variants: the number of volumes to come is not mentioned. For a comparative study of the several books, from the historical, medical or literary points of view, the student must still depend upon Littré.

The admirable English edition of Hippocrates by Adams, published by the Sydenham Society in 1849, an edition professing to be confined to the 'authentic works' but happily going much beyond its promise, (for well equipped as Adams was in all other respects he was not severely critical in respect of authenticity) has made us in England independent of other translations. At the same time we welcome the first instalment of what will prove to be the standard translation into German by the competent hand of Dr. Fuchs. The volume is handsome in form and well printed in roman type. I cannot pretend to have done more than sample the workmanship by taking passages here and there for purposes

of comparison; nor can I pretend to the grammatical scholarship which would make my opinion a valuable one in this respect; but I may be permitted to say that the translation is very readable, and that in substance it is careful and close to the text. Of its accuracy in the finer grammar, I leave others to speak; but meanwhile I have no hesitation in saying that Dr. Fuchs' rendering of this important body of doctrine and literature is a valuable and a faithful one. It is to be hoped that this translation, with that of Adams, will be the means of spreading the knowledge of the Hippocratic writings beyond the circle of professed scholars; and may lead to a better knowledge of one of the finest spirits in the history of scientific discovery, of the emancipation of the human mind, and of the devotion of man's faculties to the solace of his kind. The translator has added some notes to the text which are brief and to the point; but there are no excursus or other essays. As the work is handsome in form, I think that these omissions are to be regretted on behalf of the ordinary reader; perhaps a supplementary critical volume will be issued. The volume now issued contains neither index nor even table of contents.

The last work on my list is a very interesting essay on the Glossary of Erotian by Johannes Ilberg, whose prolegomena to Kuehlewein's edition of Hippocrates are reviewed above. Erotian's glossary to the Hippocratean writings is invaluable as a clue to their interpretation. Ilberg does not tell us whether Erotian was grammarian or physician; probably because he knows no more of him than the rest of us who only recognise in him one of the best of the Alexandrian school of grammarians. First printed by Stephens the glossary, which formed the basis of the excellent commentary of Foesius in his classical edition of the Hippocratean treatises, was published separately by him at Frankfort in 1588 under the name of the Oeconomia of Hippocrates; and it is still indispensable to students of the Collection.

Most unfortunately the early editors of Erotian's glossary have so tampered with its form that much of its value is lost, in part probably for ever. It is as a contribution to the reconstruction of the glossary in its original form that Ilberg has published this communication in the Transactions from which it is separately reprinted. I may perhaps here supplement Ilberg's essay by saying that Erotian was living, probably at Rome, in the reign of Nero. His list of the canon contains some titles of works of the school which are lost; on the other hand some titles of extant works are omitted.

There is little doubt that the explanatory matter was originally written as a commentary upon the margins of Erotian's copy of the Hippocratic collection. Then came a clumsy digester of these notes who reduced the matter into alphabetical order, but did not give himself the trouble to retain the textual references. He was followed by other blunderers of the same kind. Thus, unless in the case of *ἅπαξ εἰρήμενα*, the commentary retains but a restricted value, and is almost useless in respect of recensions. For instance, if certain words of Erotian can definitely be restored to the *Περὶ ἀέρων, ὑδάτων, τόπων*, lost portions of value referring to Egypt and Lybia can be saved. How by the comparison of scholia, and especially of certain marginal notes in the Vatican Library, subsequent editors have endeavoured to restore the original form of Erotian's glossary as a running commentary, I must leave the reader to learn from the orderly exposition of Herr Ilberg; the chapter is well worth reading as an example of scholarly ingenuity and industry. In his second chapter Ilberg discusses generally the scholia of Hippocrates and their sources. He observes that the most difficult task in this study is to trace out the influence of Galen upon the Hippocratic tradition: that Galen's school has left decided traces upon our manuscripts is certain. The list of genuine books as accepted by Erotian is discussed by Ilberg, and is shown, as we might expect, to have but a relative value.

Ilberg concludes his interesting essay with the words that 'Auf Grund unserer Untersuchung wird es nunmehr möglich sein, bei weitem den grössten Theil der Erotianischen Glossen mit dem Ursprungszeugniss zu versehen.'

T. Clifford Allbutt.

THE BATRACHOMACHIA.

Die homerische Batrachomachia des Karers Pigres nebst Scholien und Paraphrase. Herausgegeben und erläutert von ARTHUR LUDWICH. Leipzig, Teubner. 1896. M. 20.[1]

JUSTICE cannot be done to this monument of learning in the limits of a review. The pretty poem of 303 lines in which the fates of the Frogs and Mice are recounted is furnished with 483 pages of evidence and and illustration by Prof. Ludwich of Königsberg, who thus makes a most weighty addition to his long list of services to Homer.[2] The editor tells us that it is thirty years since he began to collect material, and he arranges beneath his text the testimony of no less than seventy-four MSS. Prolegomena, 140 pp. long and divided into 40 chapters, precede the text: it is followed by 109 pages of practically unedited scholia, 10 of paraphrase, 106 of commentary, and the book ends with two indices verborum, one containing the vocabulary of the poem, the other that of the scholia, the latter of which, as the author says, will be useful to the next editor of Du Cange.

I will briefly summarise the prolegomena. § 1 'Thiersage' and § 2 'Thierepos' treat in an interesting way and with breadth of erudition the relation of the Batr. to the same or similar generic compositions in Greek or Northern literatures; § 3 accumulates and discusses the evidence for the title, which Ludwich fixes as *βατραχομαχία*, to the omission of *-μυο-*; §§ 4–6 settle the age and authorship of the poem. The traditional ascription to Pigres, brother of the Queen of Halicarnassus who made herself a name at Salamis is supported by the language of the poem, and by the comparison of the parodic epic literature from Hipponax downwards, of which the chief representatives are the fourth and third century gastronomic writers Matro and Archestratus. These form a *terminus ad quem*, in contrast to which the style of the Batr. (when purged of its Byzantine accretions) suits well with the literary circle of Panyasis and Herodotus. This date appears so secure that I cannot but think the attempt on p. 21 to connect the epithet *μυομαχία* in Plutarch with *μύειν* and *μυστικὴ σιωπή* supersubtle. §§ 7–9 contain many just and acute observations on the literary nature and intention of the poem; much sound and moderate criticism will be found therein. § 10 accumulates evidence to shew how completely the Batr., though in its origin a pure *παίγνιον*, became a Byzantine schoolbook. The extraordinary abundance of MSS. from the 10th to the 16th centuries, the unwonted and astonishing wealth of alternatives (both of words and of lines), and the purely didactic character of much of the scholia, to say nothing of the innocent and mildly moral tendency of the verses themselves, amply demonstrate this. The Batr. in fact was the most popular and widely-read member of the series of Constantinopolitan schoolbooks, which included the Prometheus Vinctus, the Electra, the Hecuba and Phoenissae, the Plutus, bits of Pindar and Theocritus, and the early books of the *Iliad*. Had not the Turk stepped in to arrest, and printing to eternise, this development, these few specimens would have been all that the western world knew of Hellenic verse.

§ 11 enumerates 74 manuscripts, of which four, Barocci 50 (this is perhaps X—XI.), Laur. XXXII. 3 (C of the *Iliad*), Paris suppl. grec. 690, and Escorialensis Ω. I. 12 belong to the 11th century. Of the rest two are of the 12th, four of the 13th, nine of the 14th, two 14th—15th, some forty-five of the 15th, the remainder of the 16th. § 13—§ 34 are taken up with the establishment of classes and families among this crowd of documents; I have read them with lively interest and admiration. They are a model of patient and rigorous method. To the truth of conclusions like these naturally no testimony of value can be given except by those who have gone through the same process as the author, and this perhaps a

[1] I take this opportunity—as I am not likely to publish anything on the Homeric Hymns for some months to come—to make an observation or two on the interesting discussion that has been going on in these pages.

I regret that Prof. Tyrrell (Feb., p. 28) thinks that no one shares his confidence in the soundness of his ἔσσο, Herm. 33. The Oxford editors did what they could in this sense by printing it and *κῶζ' ἤδιστ'* also (Dem. 12) in their text.

Mr. Agar's pious prayer (p. 31) has been heard. I do not rely on Mr. Platt's metrical canon. But the 'analogical but unauthenticated' *ὄνεαρ* is likely to appear in the next Oxford edition unless in the meantime Mr. Agar provides something better than *ὄνειαρ καὶ πολὺ χάρμα*. A place will be found for *οὐδέ σε λήσει*, Apoll. 53.

[2] The edition absorbs L.'s Königsberg programmes on the same subject, 1894.

reviewer may be excused. Prof. Ludwich (p. 56) arranges his troop into 4 classes, which contain respectively 4, 3, 3 and 2 families; the representatives of the 1st class are Barocci 50, and Paris suppl. 690; of the 4th, the Florentine and Escurial MSS., while the 2nd and 3rd classes contain principally late copies. The editor believes in the goodness of the older MSS. rather than the younger (and here I imagine most readers will agree with him); of classes 4 and 1 he prefers the 1st, and throughout his text pays deference to the evidence of Barocci 50—a beautifully-written book, which contains mainly grammatical treatises utilised by Cramer in his Anec. Ox. but also a quantity of minor Greek verse, among which it is to be regretted that Pindar, Theocritus and the Homeric Hymns do not find a place.

These sections contain a great deal of most interesting matter bearing upon the peculiarities of the text of the Batr., which only long familiarity with the documents would qualify a reviewer to appraise. I may be permitted to mention the more general qualities of impartiality, objectivity and moderation, as distinguishing the investigation from most others of the same sort. A modified eclecticism is the editor's principle, and no other, it appears to me, unless under exceptional circumstances, is reasonable. The accidents of time and circumstance are so incalculable that to regard one family or one MS. as the depository of all truth is to sacrifice the facts to 'method.' § 34—§ 38 treat the scholia, paraphrase and glosses, over which great labour has been spent. § 39 describes the archetype of the existing MSS. as the editor represents it to himself. He carries back with some probability the Byzantine text, in its main features, to the time of Alciphron and Herodian the grammarian.

The constitution of the text of the Batr. is a very interesting question. The editor remarks with justice that there 'existirt ausser ihr kein anderes griechisches Gedicht von ebenso mässigem Umfange mit ebenso übermässiger Verunstaltung.' The variants are of the most bewildering sort and unite every known category of corruption. Mr. Platt who has somewhere called the MSS. of the Homeric Hymns 'shameful,' would be at a loss for parliamentary language in which to express his opinion of the tradition of the Batr. It occupies a position halfway between the other Homeric poems; the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* enjoy a more abundant tradition, but their variants are controlled by the extensive and explicit information that we possess upon the Alexandrine and pre-Alexandrine text; the Hymns are like the Batr. in their neglect by classical antiquity, but their tradition is scanty and there are no signs that Byzantine instructors added largely to their bulk. The very number of lines of the Batr. varies materially in different copies. A well-thumbed schoolbook, extensively reproduced by the publishing trade, of naturally ambiguous semi-epic style, it offered uncommon facilities for addition and alteration. The separation of these later additions from the original stock forms the principal task of criticism on the Batr. The editor with characteristic modesty prints two columns of text; in the former he puts the traditional readings selected from the MSS. mostly, though not invariably, according to the canons of their goodness already ascertained; in the second, his own reconstruction of their common archetype. It is not to be supposed, nor does the editor anticipate, that this reconstruction will satisfy the learned public in all points. Indeed failing papyrus, our only friend, these ancient documents will remain to the end of time things on which we must agree to differ. Meanwhile for critics other than 'brilliant,' the one profitable principle is to abstain from conjectures that are imperatively ruled out by the elementary conditions of palaeography.

To criticise half the sore places in the Batr. would need a separate treatise. I must content myself with noticing a few points in the first hundred lines. V. 1. *ἀρχόμενος πρῶτον μουσῶν χορὸν ἐξ Ἑλικῶνος* codd. *πρώτης σελίδος* Z. I cannot think *πρώτης σελίδος* original: the word is not cited earlier than Posidippus, it is peculiar to Z, and seems more natural to a schoolboy than a poet. Perhaps it was invented to meet the difficulty of *ἀρχόμενος πρῶτον*. V. 3. *ἦν νεὸν ἐν δέλτοισιν ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ γούνασι θῆκα*. L.'s alteration of *θῆκα* into *θήσω* seems unnecessary: the poet lays his theme upon his knee and asks for inspiration. The scholiast's paraphrase is substantially right, *ἦν ἐν ταῖς βίβλοις ἐγγράφων καὶ χαράττων δηλονότι ἔθηκα ἐν τοῖς ἐμοῖς γόνασιν. νέον* is adv. V. 8 *ὡς λόγος ἐν θνητοῖσιν ἔην τοίην δ' ἔχον* [*ἔχεν* or *ἔσχεν* plerique] *ἀρχήν*. One of L.'s suggestions, *τοιὴ δ' ἔχεν ἀρχή*, occurred to me, cl. h. Apoll. 228 *ἀλλ' ἔχεν ὕλη* (Barnes for *ὕλην*) Φ 177 *τρὶς δὲ μεθῆκε βίη* (*βίης βίῃ βίην*), but the vulg. suffices. V. 20 *ἠριδανοῖο, ὠκεανοῖο*. The same variant Π 151, where it may receive some confirmation from this parody. Vv. 23, 24 *σκηπ-*

τοῦχον βασιλῆα καὶ ἐν πολέμοισι μαχητὴν| ἔμμεναι. ἀλλ' ἄγε θᾶσσον ἐὴν γενεὴν ἀγόρευε om. Oxf. Rom. Par.[2] (three families of the same class). The lines are unnecessary it is true, but not on that account late; they belong to the commonest category of epic variant, the dispensable supplement. ἐὴν = σὴν is not conclusive; Aeschylus uses ἑαυτοῦ &c. for the second person, and in the loss of serious epic literature between the Hymns and Alexandria it is impossible to say that Panyasis and Antimachus may not have used ἑός = σός. 25. τίπτε γένος τοὐμὸν ζητεῖς; the variants on the rest of the line seem to point to a pair of readings φίλε δῆλον ἅπασι, and τὸ δὲ δῆλον ἅπασι. Z has τὸ δ' ἄσημον ἅπασι, from which I hardly think L. right in deducing εὔσημον ἅπασι. The permutation of α and the ligature ευ is usually confined to late minuscules, and Z is not far from the uncial limit. 30. γείνατο δ' ἐν Καλύβῃ με καὶ ἔρριψε νέμεσθαι Z, ἐξέθρεψατο βρωτοῖς cet. Accepting Z.'s reading I prefer L.'s earlier conj. εἰσέρριψε (why not ἐξέρριψε?) to his later invention ἔκρυψ' ἐννεμέθεσθαι. 36. ἔχων πολὺ σησαμότυρον. I agree with L. in printing this; the alternative, the unmetrical πολλὴν σισαμίδα, is the gloss on it, accepted by the same Byzantines to whom the following passage is due. 42–52 om. ZII. The view to be taken of these vv. is of vital consequence to the Batr. as a whole. The editor while lending weight to their omission by his best family, still regards them as ancient, part perhaps of another poem of Pigres (!), and accordingly rewrites the lines which betray the worst metrical faults. I cannot but think this a mistaken policy. (1) There is no homœoteleuton, homœarchon or other palæographical condition to explain their omission in ZII; the presumption is therefore that they are an addition in the other MSS. (2) In purport they are not contemptible, but I presume that it was not beyond the powers of Byzantines of the IXth century to compose additions to a fable of this sort; putting such additions into good hexameters would have been the difficulty. (3) There is no reason why these lines should have undergone more metrical corruption than the rest. To say they resided on a margin and therefore (though why?) were damaged, is to beg the question. Such lines as οὐδέ ποτε πτολέμοιο κακὴν ἀπέφυγον ἀυτήν, νήδυμος οὐκ ἀπέφυγεν ὕπνος δάκνοντος ἐμεῖο, ἄνθρῶπον οὐ δέδια καίπερ μέγα σῶμα φοροῦντα, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ λέκτρον ἰὼν ἄκρὸν δάκτυλὸν δάκνω are such as would have been composed by learned men acquainted with the epic dialect but who had lost the sense of quantitative metre. They remind me of the gems of the Periochae to the books of the *Iliad*, Ζῆτα δ' ἰρεῖ' ἑκάβη ἀθῆνᾶς ἐπὶ γούνασι θῆκεν, πὶ πάτροκλος πέφνε σἄρπηδόνα καὶ θάνεν αὐτός, ῥῶ δαναοὶ τρῶες τε ἄμφὶ νέκυν πᾶριμάχοντο, &c.; and it seems a mistake to rearrange them into ἀπέφευγον ἀυτήν, νήδυμος οὐκ ἀπέφευγε πόνος, οὐ δέδι' ἄνθρωπον, ἔδακον κατὰ δάκτυλον ἄκρον. Similarly at 113 *sq.*, 210 *sq.*, and elsewhere I am not clear as to the reasons that impel the editor to reject some alternative lines, and to keep others equally unmusical, doctoring them into metre. Another point where I find myself at variance with the learned editor is the expedient of transposition, which he employs largely, 65 *sq.*, 184 *sq.*, and elsewhere. The question is thorny; I must content myself with expressing my belief that MSS. as we know them were not largely liable to this source of corruption; nor do I agree with the editor's theory [p. 102] that lines originally omitted and added on a margin, got into a wrong place in the text of the next copy.

The edition it need hardly be said supersedes its predecessors, Baumeister, Abel and Brandt, in which we were accustomed to read the Batrachomachia. At the same time whatever is of value in them and the earlier editions is presented here: in few modern books is so much justice done to the past.

THOMAS W. ALLEN.

POSTGATE'S EDITION OF THE SEVENTH BOOK OF LUCAN.

M. Annaei Lucani De Bello Civili, Liber VII. With introduction, notes and critical appendix by J. P. POSTGATE, LITT.D. Cambridge, University Press, 1896. 2*s*.

To those who wish to be introduced to the peculiar style of this poet, at once so attractive for his brilliancy of epigram, and so disappointing for his shallow soullessness and redundant rhetoric, this book will be of the utmost service. The historical introduction gives a full and vivid account of the battle of Pharsalia, based on a comparison of the ancient authorities. The exact learning and conciseness of the notes leave

little to be desired; perhaps the great difficulty of Lucan, the difficulty of following his connexion and appreciating his bold expressions, might have been met better by introducing rather more translation and curtailing the comments. But the work is the loving work of a scholar who has much to teach. I offer with diffidence some suggestions towards improvements in the next edition.

Line 28 *unde pares somnos populis noctemque beatam?* would be best explained by a translation: 'how couldst thou, Pompey, have slumbers like the multitude and a night of joy?' Cp. Hor. *Sat.* 2, 5, 102 *unde mihi tam fortem tamque fidelem?* In the next line *si te uel sic tua Roma uideret* is passed over. I think *uel sic* refers to *funestas acies* 27 and it means 'O happy, if thy Rome had seen thee even defeated,' whereas, in fact, Pompey never returned to Rome. L. 93 *labor belli* = *μάχης πόνος Il.* 16, 568, and has no reference to "the exceedingly toilsome character of Roman warfare." *Labor* in this sense belongs to the epic vocabulary: Verg. *Aen.* 2, 619 *finemque inpone labori:* 12, 727 *quem damnet labor.* L. 162 *signa uix reuolsa solo* is probably a reminiscence of Liv. 22, 3, § 12 *nuntiatur signum omni ui moliente signifero conuelli nequire:* l. 165 *fugit ab ara taurus* of Liv. 21, 63, § 13 *immolantique ei uitulus iam ictus e manibus sacrificantium esse cum proripuisset.* L. 268 "*nihil esse recuso, i.e.* I am prepared to be anything," hardly brings out the point. Rather 'there is nought (hateful) that I refuse to be,' explained by the following words *inuidia regnate mea.* L. 273 *non illa* from the note might be inferred to be a mannerism of Horace and Vergil; but it is of general occurrence, cp. Liv. 22,5, § 7 *non illa ordinata per principes.* L. 287 *ensem* is the 'sword,' not the "sword stroke," as *lancea* is the lance in the next line. Here again Lucan is probably thinking of Livy 21, 43, § 17. I have often wondered that Lucan's careful study of Livy has received so little attention. L. 320 *dum tela micant* requires explanation: it means 'while darts fly to and fro:' Liv. 6, 12, § 9 *tum micent gladii:* 21, 7, § 8 *non pro moenibus modo atque turri tela micare.* Verg. *Aen.* 10, 396 *semanimesque micant digiti.* L. 325 *ignoti iugulum tamquam scelus inputet hostis:* the note is long and obscure, and leaves me in doubt as to the meaning, which I take to be: 'Mar with the sword faces you should respect, whether it be that a man shall advance with ravening steel against his kinsfolks' breasts, or shall disfigure no dear one with his sword; he should regard it as a crime to slay a stranger foeman.' The troops are to kill Italians only, whether related to them or not: non-Italian combatants are to be disregarded. The subject to *inputet* is supplied from *quis:* the meaning of *pignus*, a relation, common in Ovid, might have been illustrated. L. 395 *nocte coacta*, a night 'forced upon him,' is erroneously illustrated from Ov. *Trist.* 4, 10, 35 *claui mensura coacta est*, which, of course, means 'the size of my stripe was curtailed,' *i.e.* I wore the *angustus clauus.* L. 414: on *laturos* it is said that "the fut. part. in poets often appears to differ little from a present:" this seems doubtful; at any rate here *laturos* = 'ready to hurl.'

The critical appendix, the materials of which are taken almost entirely from Hosius, invites consideration, as Dr. Postgate has produced an independent text. I assign a very high value to M, the Montepessulanus, which, though not always right, is generally superior to the other MSS., and which is sometimes unwisely deserted by Dr. Postgate. Francken's edition containing the Ashburnham MS. contains only books I.—V.

The following changes are improvements: 130 *mortis uenturaest* (*uentura est* M): 179 *defunctosque ululare patres et sanguinis umbras* for *defunctosque patres et cunctas sanguinis umbras.* 575 *confundere* (for *contundere*) *uoltus* restored from V. 622 *ore quis aduerso demissum faucibus ensem expulerit moriens anima;* for *moriens, animam* restored from U. 658 *uoluitque* (for *volvitque*) *sui solacia casus.*

It is clear that our MSS. descend from two or more archetypes: therefore omissions such as line 90 by MB, line 257, found only in G mvbe, and 796, omitted by MGU, do not seem to me to throw any doubt on the genuineness of these lines, but prove that the exemplar copied was in those places damaged or illegible: the dislocations at 488-521, where the new order adopted by Dr. Postgate seems very probable, indicate that this kind of fault existed early in the MSS.

In the following passages the text seems to be questionable: 180 *dementibus unum hoc solamen erat:* here *dementibus* is the editor's emendation for *sed mentibus*, which is, I think, sound: 'still this was the only consolation to their hearts,' *i.e.* though frightened by spectres they take an insane pleasure in horrors.

262 *gladioque exsoluite culpam* (from G) for *gladiosque exsoluite culpa* (M), *i.e.* 'free yourselves from guilt by the sword' instead

of 'free your swords from guilt,' *i.e.* by victory, seems doubtful, as the next line *nulla manus belli mutato iudice pura est* seems intended to explain the meaning. Why should Dr. Postgate desert M for G here, when he rejects 257-258 because they are contained in G but not in M? Again in 286 he adopts *quarum* from BCU instead of the quite simple *quorum* of MGV, thus abandoning both the excellent M and his new ally G.

303 *poena paratur* BEUG is rightly read for *poena parata* M. It might have been pointed out that the mistake of M is due to the tendency of MSS. to assimilate terminations, *e.g.* 309 where M has *fodientia* (for *fodientem*) *uiscera* on account of *uiscera:* so 1, 435 *canas* (for *cana*) *pendentes rupe Cebennas:* 2, 51 *non adliget Hister, fundet* etc. (for *fundat*): 2, 155 *praecipiti iaculatus pondere duro* (for *dura*) *dissiluit percussus humo* (error due to *pondere*).

334-335 *si totidem Magni soceros totidemque petentes urbis regna suae funesto in Marte locasses*, the conjecture of Grotius *locasses* is adopted for *locasset* MSS., "for Lucan would not have said 'si Caesar in Marte locasset totidem Caesares' (*Magni soceros*), and he has just told us Caesar did not arrange his men." But Hosius is right in keeping *locasset:* the meaning is 'If Caesar had (which he did not do) arranged so many Caesars.' The subjunctive mood shows this. And *locasses*, which must be addressed to the reader, is awkwardly abrupt.

504–505 *nec Fortuna diu rerum tot pondera uertens abstulit ingentis fato torrente ruinas* means 'and Chance who was overthrowing so many weighty interests did not long withhold the dire downfall whirled on by destiny.' The text is quite sound: the very abundance of measures proposed for its reformation in the note makes them improbable.

522 *tenet obliquas post terga cohortes* means Caesar *keeps* six cohorts behind in reserve. *Tenet* does not require alteration, such as *ciet* proposed.

587 *quid ferrum, Brute, tenebas* so Postgate following Hosius reads from a lost Hamburg MS. *quod ferrum* MSS. 'what sort of a sword were you wielding' is certainly weak. Perhaps *quoi* (*cui*) should be read: 'against whom,' *i.e.* Caesar (dat. incommodi).

625 *quis cruor e scissis perruperit aera uenis inque hostis cadat arma sui.* Here *e scissis* is the editor's conjecture for *emissis* MSS. But *emissis* seems to me unquestionably right; though *uenis* does not then mean 'blood,' as Dr. Postgate says, but 'veins': translate 'whose blood has dashed through the air when the veins have been loosened (opened) and falls on the arms of its enemy.' *Quis*, I think, is not nom. but dat. pl.: *emissis uenis* is a bold variation on such a phrase as *sanguine uenis emisso* Plin. *H. N.* 25, 23, § 56. With similar boldness in 735 *aut Marte subactis* means not 'conquered' but 'exhausted' by war i. q *confectis.* To read *ac Marte peractis* is to rewrite Lucan.

I take this opportunity of offering the following suggestions.

140 *tunc omnes lancea saxo erigitur* MSS. has no satisfactory meaning. Read *exigitur* 'is tested': Cic. in Verr. 2, 1, § 133 *ad perpendiculum columnas exigere* (Postgate's *corrigitur* is rather violent).

156 *et trabibus mixtis auidos typhonas aquarum detulit* (*pytonas* BM) so Hosius and Postgate: but *typhonas* seems to have to do with fire not water. The conjecture *siphonas* (Grotius) seems to have been a reading known to the scholiast: I think it is right, and means 'water spouts.' See Munro's note on Aetna 327.

462. Here the MSS. vary greatly, the Palatine palimpsest of the fourth century has VVLTVSQVONO the rest of the line being lost. M has apparently *tempus quo noscere possent* and so V. Read *uultu quoque noscere tempus, facturi quae monstra forent. Possent* seems to be a gloss intended to explain the absence of the verb. (Postgate's *uultusque ac noscere tempus* is harsh in sound.)

I have noticed the following misprints: p. 67 three lines from the bottom *reflection* for *reflexion:* p. 68, line 1 *pellets* should, I think, be *bullets*, at least the latter word would be happier: p. 76, note on 676 *sq.*, *desired* should be *denied:* p. 94 note on 462-3, 'he does not quote 462' should be '463.'

S. G. Owen.

HAUVETTE ON THE EPIGRAMS OF SIMONIDES.

De l'Authenticité des Épigrammes de Simonide, par Amédée Hauvette. (Bibliothèque de la Faculté des Lettres de Paris); Paris. 1896. 5 Fr.

The aim of the writer of this book is to determine, by a detailed examination of all the epigrams attributed to Simonides, in which we may recognise the genuine work of that poet. To this end M. Hauvette gives us first a 'critical examination of the sources' *i.e.* of all the ancient authors (in historical sequence) who preserve the epigrams assigned to Simonides, and afterwards a collection of the epigrams themselves, with a copious commentary. Twenty are selected as being, beyond reasonable doubt, authentic, while the remainder are weighed in the balance with regard to the merits of each individual case. In twenty-one cases the judgment of M. Hauvette is in favour of admitting the genuineness of the epigram. Thus we have forty-one epigrams in all whose authenticity is admitted, against sixty condemned—forty-nine with some hesitation, eleven without discussion.

Now it may be granted that the ultimate aim of criticism is to separate the genuine work of Simonides from that which falsely bears his name: but opinions may differ as to the means to be employed to this end. Surely the first task of the critic should be to form a clear idea of the literary history of Simonides' epigrams—the date at which a collection first appeared in book-form bearing his name, the contents of that collection, and its subsequent history. For this purpose we must be ready, if necessary, to draw analogies from similar collections ascribed to other poets—in other words, it is necessary to study the history of the epigram as a literary 'genre' among the Greeks, in order to approach the special problem offered by Simonides. M. Hauvette's attitude towards these questions does not seem to be altogether satisfactory. The first section of his work does indeed present itself as in some sort an effort to reconstruct the literary history of the Simonidean collection. Such a collection, says the author, was used by Chamaeleon, if not by Aristotle. Portions of it were incorporated into the Στέφανος of Meleager, and have thus been in part transmitted to us through the anthologies of Cephalas and Planudes. But it would seem (although M. Hauvette leaves this to the inference of the reader) that the original collection was little read in later antiquity: for the quotations of Plutarch, the Pseudo-Dion, Pausanias and Aristides are not to be regarded as drawn from the collection itself, but from other sources. Grammarians, however, such as Herodian, and metrical writers like Hephaestion, still drew upon the 'authorised edition.' If we inquire, however, on what grounds it is maintained that some quotations are drawn from the collected epigrams, while others are not, we cannot help suspecting M. Hauvette of a tendency to assume that which stands in need of proof, viz. that the collection which is on p. 22 expressly affirmed to be pre-Alexandrine (as against Weisshaüpl), but notwithstanding seems afterwards to be spoken of as 'the Alexandrine collection' (cf. pp. 27, 30), was, *on the whole*, free from epigrams falsely attributed to Simonides. Now it seems clear (1) that the collection of epigrams assigned to Simonides was already in existence at the beginning of the Alexandrine period, (2) that it contained epigrams often copied from existing monuments, but assigned, without evidence, and even contrary to evidence, to Simonides. Had M. Hauvette consulted the pages which Reitzenstein (*Epigramm und Skolion* 107 ff.) has devoted to the question—it does not appear that the work was before him—he might have abandoned the *parti pris* which makes him careful of questioning the Alexandrine tradition. While much that is put forward by Reitzenstein must be discounted as pure hypothesis—*e.g.* the 'Peloponnesian recension' of Simonides—he has at least made it plain that the 'Simonides' presupposed by the Alexandrines and the Anthology is essentially of the same order as the 'Anakreon' and even the 'Archilochos' of the same tradition. Just as *A.P.* vi. 138, (attributed to Anacreon), has come to light as a genuine Attic inscription half a century later than the time of the poet (*C.I.A.* i. 381), so, *e.g.* Simonides 188 Bergk (rejected without discussion by Hauvette on the ground of its date) was a genuine inscription, seen at Olympia by Pausanias, and even M. Hauvette does not venture to deny that Hephaestion drew it from the 'recueil alexandrin': but such errors, he says, were the exception, not the rule. Without presuming to determine in what proportion

the true and the false were mingled in that collection, we may assert that it was in all likelihood neither worse, nor much better, than those ascribed to other poets. In this connection a fuller treatment of that most interesting document, *A.P.* xiii. 28 (Hauvette, No. 83), would have been desirable. Besides the lemma Βακχυλίδου ἢ Σιμωνίδου of the Palatine MS. we have a *probable* reference in Stephanus of Byzantium s.v. Ἀκαμαντίον to the authorship of Simonides. What the poem really is, has been shown by Wilamowitz in a brilliant article (Hermes xx. 68 ff.) to which M. Hauvette makes no reference. Again, the significance of the variants in the tradition of the famous epigram on the tomb of the Spartans at Thermopylae does not seem to have been grasped by M. Hauvette. The form πειθόμενοι νομίμοις is found in all the authors, beginning with Lycurgus (the Anthology excepted), who quote the epigram. Herodotus, however, gives the genuine ῥήμασι πειθόμενοι. Instead of accepting the simple inference that the doctored text circulated in the time of Lycurgus, M. Hauvette makes the complicated assumption that the correction was perhaps made on the marble, either through inadvertence or by intention, and thence transferred to later collections (p. 42 f.). Once more: the famous epigram Ἑλλήνων προμαχοῦντες κ.τ.λ. is cited by Lycurgus with the pentameter χρυσοφόρων Μήδων ἐστόρεσαν δύναμιν: Aristides and later authorities give ἔκτειναν Μήδων ἐννέα (or even εἴκοσι) μυριάδας. M. Hauvette is at pains to show (in Part I.) that Aristides had no edition of Simonides before him; he therefore (p. 72) says that the inscription may very well have been quoted by Aristides *from a corrupt text of Lycurgus*. Manifestly Aristides is quoting from a 'doctored' edition of the poems of Simonides.

Enough has been said to show that M. Hauvette does not seem to have solved, or even to have grasped, the preliminary problems which beset the literary history of 'Simonides.' His discussions of individual epigrams will be read with interest, and are less open to criticism. A firmer hand in dealing with the dialectic forms might be desired. For example, in No. 3, where τέτορες is preserved by metre and Πελοποννάσου by one family of the MSS. of Herodotus, it seems beneath the dignity of criticism to invoke Diodorus (wrongly), Aristides, and the Anthology in favour of retaining the Ionic colouring of the hexameter. As to the genuineness of particular epigrams, it is not likely that any editor will succeed in establishing an unquestioned series of judgments. Many will be disposed to question the authenticity even of some poems which appear among the twenty 'épigrammes authentiques' of M. Hauvette, *e.g.* the epitaph on the dog Lycas (No. 5), which seems to be a literary exercise of the class brought into fashion by Anyte. Others may refuse to see in the silence of Plutarch a reason for condemning the couplet inscribed by the Corinthian trierarch Diodorus on the spoils consecrated after Salamis (No. 63), while No. 62 (Bergk 101, attributed to Simonides in the Anthology and by the Scholiast on Aristides) belongs to the more favoured category. The criteria laid down by M. Hauvette are at times somewhat rigidly applied; it is no doubt characteristic of the best attested four-line epigrams of Simonides that the two couplets are independent in sense, but there is no reason to think that Simonides would not have broken the rule, and we can scarcely use the argument, *e.g.* against No. 47, where M. Hauvette has mistaken the sense of the opening words, evidently a reminiscence of the Homeric οἶνος καὶ Κένταυρον (φ 295). But it may be questioned whether a somewhat *a priori* discussion of each epigram does much to increase our certainty as to the genuine work of Simonides. A clearer conception of the history of the epigram in Greek literature, and a more searching analysis of the earlier collections embodied in the Στέφανος of Meleager are needed, before individual epigrams will fall into their proper places.

H. Stuart Jones.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

THE ORIGIN OF MONEY.

Les Origines de la Monnaie. Ernest Babelon. Paris, Didot. 1897. Fr. 3.50.

Some of M. Babelon's best work has been concerned with the early monetary issues of Asia. It is therefore with satisfaction that we greet an exposition of his views in regard to the origin of coin. No one has a better right to be heard in the matter.

A great part of the work before us does not come into the field to which the *Classical Review* is confined. M. Babelon discusses many economic questions as to the function of money and its working. He also speaks of the systems of barter in use in primitive societies, of hatchets, caldrons and bars of metal which passed as a measure of value, and a medium of exchange. Into these fields I shall not follow him. My observations will be limited to the two subjects of the origin of money in Greece and Asia, and the character of the earliest issues in electrum, chapters 3 and 7.

The most original and important chapter of M. Babelon's book is the third. Hitherto two views have been current in regard to the question who first issued money; the common view, which regards it as having been first struck by authority of states and cities, and the view of Prof. Ernst Curtius, that the first issues were those of temples. M. Babelon seeks to establish a third view. He thinks that between the circulation of bars and rings of fixed weight and the rise of the regular state coinages of Greece there intervened a time when currency was mainly in the the form of coin, but coin issued by private bankers, rather than by any civic or religious authority. It is to the τραπεζίτης that he assigns the honour of the invention of money. This earliest specie is largely represented in our collections; it consists mainly of beans or pellets of electrum indented with punch-marks, but not usually bearing stamps which can be assigned to particular cities. After a time the untrustworthiness of these private issues, and the impurity of their metal caused them to be superseded by state coinages, by that of Croesus in Lydia, and by that of Pheidon and other innovators in Greece proper.

Such is M. Babelon's view. He does not seriously attempt to prove it: perhaps in the nature of the case proof is impossible. But he tries to render it probable by various arguments. Perhaps his strongest point is analogy. He shows that in many countries private issues of money have preceded or supplemented those which are public, in China, in India, in Russia, and elsewhere. It is impossible to say that some of the early electrum coin of the Ionic coast cannot have had this character. And it seems natural that bankers who dealt with large quantities of precious metal should have divided up the bars of gold and electrum into pieces of convenient size, and guaranteed their weight by a well known mark.

At the same time, when one passes from the inherent probability of M. Babelon's view, to the particular form in which he states it, one is obliged to take some exception. The early coins of Phocaea (type, a seal), and of Cyzicus (type, a tunny), have on the reverse punch-marks of irregular form. M. Babelon thinks that these were not state issues, but struck by bankers at Phocaea and Cyzicus respectively, the punch-mark being the stamp of the banker himself. This seems very improbable. The well-known coin which bears the name of Phanes and the type of a stag is regarded by M. Babelon as struck at Ephesus by a banker named Phanes. This is even more unlikely. The stag, according to the inscription, is the sign or mark of Phanes: it cannot at the same time prove the coin to belong to Ephesus. As the coin in question was found at Halicarnassus, and as the only Phanes known to history was a prominent Halicarnassian of the time of Cambyses, it seems unnecessary to seek for it another place of issue than the city of Herodotus.

M. Babelon is also not always in accord with the evidence in sketching the early history of the electrum coinage. It is true that the very early issues of electrum are most irregular as to the proportion of gold to silver which they contain. But the regular civic issues of a somewhat later date are in this matter not much more trustworthy. The experiments of Mr. Head, and my own, (*Numismatic Chronicle*, 1887) have shown that from first to last the composition of electrum coins is in the highest degree irregular: but that in the average of cases, the value of them compared with pure gold is so low as to render exceedingly improbable the view of Brandis, that they passed at three-

fourths of the value of gold. This latter view M. Babelon accepts (p. 318). At the same time however he accepts another view scarcely consistent with it, that the Daric and the Cyzicene stater (nearly double its weight) were of equal value. However, details apart, we may welcome M. Babelon's theory as to private issues of coin, and bear it in mind in our future researches.

Many readers of the *Classical Review* will be interested to see how M. Babelon treats a well-known passage of Herodotus; Λυδοὶ . . . πρῶτοι ἀνθρώπων, τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν, νόμισμα χρυσοῦ καὶ ἀργύρου κοψάμενοι ἐχρήσαντο (I. 94). Here, following the lead of M. Six, M. Babelon regards the words of Herodotus as applying to the issues of Croesus which were the earliest or among the earliest issues in pure gold and silver: he rejects the view that Herodotus is thinking of electrum money; and regards our early electrum coins as not Lydian, but belonging to the Ionian cities. 'Ne serait-il pas étrange, qu' Hérodote, qui partout distingue avec tant de soin l'*électrum* ou l'*or blanc* de l'or proprement dit, eût, dans cette seule circonstance, désigné l'*électrum* simplement par le mot χρυσός?' The observation of M. Six is very acute: but its conclusiveness may be disputed. Nor is M. Babelon's statement quite exact. What Herodotus distinguishes are χρυσὸς λευκὸς and χρυσὸς ἄπεφθος: both alike he classes as gold; and when, as in i. 94, he speaks merely of χρυσὸς, he may mean either. Taking the statement of Herodotus then in conjunction with the statement of Xenophanes of Colophon who lived as early as the sixth century, and who regards the Lydians as the first to issue coin, we may still I think regard at least some of the earliest electrum as money of the Lydian kings. And certainly there is nothing in the coins themselves inconsistent with such a view.

We will consider only one other point, M. Babelon's view of Pheidon, and his monetary reforms. The date of Pheidon is a matter as to which our evidence is conflicting: but his connexion with the early money of Peloponnesus seems almost certain. M. Babelon speaks of Pheidon in one place (p. 213) as the propagator, not the inventor, of coinage of Aeginetan type: and indeed his connexion with Aegina is brought into doubt. In another place (p. 370) Pheidon is mentioned as the *creator* of the new system of silver money. Again M. Babelon accepts (p. 330) Prof. Ridgeway's view that the weight of the Aeginetan silver stater was fixed at 195 grains in order that ten of these staters should pass for one gold stater of 130 grains, gold being fifteen times as valuable as silver. But at the same time he admits (p. 370) that the Aeginetan standard of weight had been in use for other metals before it was applied to the silver coin. 'Phidon donna le nom d'obole au petit poids d'argent dont la valeur correspondait à celle du lingot de fer appelé ὀβολός, et qui pesait une mine.' It seems impossible that the weight of the Aeginetan drachm can have been decided by reference to a gold currency, and the weight of the obolus (or sixth of a drachm) by reference to an iron currency. The two views are alternatives, and cannot both be maintained.

Thus it appears that M. Babelon's views on early coinage cannot be accepted without modifications. But all that we can fairly expect in matters of such intricacy and obscurity is that each new writer will make some useful addition to our fabric of knowledge: and this M. Babelon has done.

As I proposed at first, I have dealt only with one or two chapters of M. Babelon's work. It contains much of interest in other directions. The writer tells us that it was originally intended for lectures, like its prototype, Lenormant's *Monnaie dans l'Antiquité*. It is not easy to follow a man like M. Lenormant: but M. Babelon does not suffer from comparison with his predecessor. Less brilliant in conjecture, he is more trustworthy in execution; and he attains with Lenormant something of the highest merit which a writer who is not exhaustive can claim, that of being suggestive.

PERCY GARDNER.

MONTHLY RECORD.

GREECE.

Athens.—Important discoveries have been made in the rocks on the north-west slope of the Acropolis by the Greek Archaeological Society. Inscriptions have been found which show that what was hitherto supposed to be the grotto of Pan must rather belong to Apollo Hypakraios; they were found on ten marble tablets let into the rock, giving the names of the ἄρχων βασιλεύς and θεσμοθέται for the year, which enables them to be dated. Before the grotto is a quadrilateral sinking in the rock in which probably stood the altar mentioned by Euripides (*Ion*, 938). Further to the east were found a series of steps hewn in the rock, and connecting with those found in 1886 inside the Acropolis. They were probably the stairs used by the Arrhephoroi.[1] [2]

In the neighbourhood of the Areopagus the German Archaeological Institute has found a fragment of the rim of a large black-glazed vessel, incised with a sharp tool with the words Θεμιστοκλῆς Φρεάρριος in archaic characters. This is obviously

[1] *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 13 Feb.
[2] *Ibid.* 27 Feb.

an ὄστρακον used for the banishment of the great Themistokles in 470 B.C. Other ὄστρακα are known with the names of Megakles and Xanthippos.[1]

Peiraeus.—The site hitherto thought to be the Serangeion has been shown by the investigations of Svoronos to belong to the epoch of the Minyae. This and the adjacent heroon belonged to the cult of Euphamos, who is identical with the sea-god Glaukos. In the Serangeion is a mosaic with representation of Glaukos in pursuit of Scylla.[2]

Salamis.—An inscription has come to light with two lines of an epitaph on Corinthians who fell in the great battle. The dialect is Doric, the alphabet Corinthian. The words imply that the Corinthians arrogated to themselves a large share in the victory.[3]

Delphi.—A new inscription which has been found is interesting in connection with the history of Thrace. It is a ψήφισμα recording the granting of a προξενία, and giving the names of four sons of Chersobleptes, the king of Thrace who is mentioned by Demosthenes (*Phil.* iv. § 133). Three of the names are purely Greek. Another inscription has been found on a column with statue erected by the people of Delphi to M. Minucius Quintus, who defeated an incursion of the Gauls into Greece.

The theatre has now been entirely laid bare. It is in close proximity to the peribolos of the temple of Apollo, and is fully preserved. There are seven κερκίδες, each with thirty-three rows of seats. On the lower row are inscriptions relating to manumissions and decrees of προξενία.[3]

H. B. Walters.

[1] *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 27 Feb.
[2] *Ibid.* 13 Feb.
[3] *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 27 Feb.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

American Journal of Philology. Vol. xvii. 3. Whole No. 67. Oct. 1896.

Some General Problems of Ablaut, C. D. Buck. A consideration of certain facts with a view to the best practical arrangement of an ablaut-system. *The Authorship of the Dialogus de Oratoribus*, R. B. Steele. Who the writer was cannot be determined, unless there may be found in some work of a later writer a direct quotation assigned to its author. Against Pliny and Quintilian, as well as Tacitus, the negative argument is conclusive. That he was a rhetorician is shown by the prevailing schoolish tone of the work. *The Dramatic Synchoregia at Athens*, E. Capps. In 406 a law was passed providing for the conjunction of two citizens in the tragic and comic choregia for the City Dionysia. Between 399 and 394 this law was repealed for tragedy, while for comedy the synchoregia was retained, and before 388 the number of comedies to be presented was increased to five. This arrangement lasted until about 340, when the old usage was re-established. *The More Complicated Figures of Comparison in Plato*, G. B. Hussey. Some of the comparisons that are confused or distorted are treated of; similar irregularities are grouped together and the causes of their confusion discussed; the structure of certain larger groups of comparisons is explained in detail. *Notes on the Historical Syntax of Quamvis*, H. D. Wild. The usage is overwhelmingly in favour of the subj. with *quamvis*. The pres. is used in considerably more than one-half of the subj. instances, a predominance due to the present tense in the second half of the compound. There is a note by E. W. Fay referring to a criticism of his essay on 'Agglutination and Adaptation' by Prof. Victor Henry. The following books are reviewed—Usener's *Götternamen: Versuch einer Lehre von der religiösen Begriffsbildung*—Leo's *Plauti Comoediae* and *Plautinische Forschungen zur Kritik und Geschichte der Komödie*—Shuckburgh's *C. Suetoni Tranquilli Divus Augustus.*

Revue de Philologie. Vol. xx. Part 4. Oct. 1896.

Inventaire sommaire des textes grecs classiques retrouvés sur papyrus, P. Couvreur. *Vitruvius Rufus*, P. Tannery. The edition of Cantor in his *Die römischen Agrimensoren* (1875) is here referred to. In § 39 for the corrupt *plictum cum caelum* it is proposed to read *cacumen perlibratum cum oculo. Phaeder*, L. Havet. Notes on iii. Prol. 38 (iii. epil. 14); 15, 20; epil. 2; v. 5, 11–12 (and i. 29, 3); append. 6, 6. *Térence, Eun.* 588, A. Macé. Conjectures *hiemem* for codd. *hominem. Notes critiques*, O. Keller. Notes on (1) Anecdota Bernensia, ed. Hagen, p. 187, (2) Alexand. Aphrodis., problem. 2, 16, (3) Orosius, vii. 9, 14. *Phèdre*, iv. 9, 2, J. Chauvin. Reads *reperire effugium alterius succurrit malo.*

Vol. xxi. Part 1. Jan. 1897.

Deux papyrus grecs du British Museum, F. G. Kenyon. (1) Fragment of a Λακεδαιμονίων πολιτεία (?). (2) Fragment on the right of requisition in Roman Egypt. *Note sur le papyrus CLXXXVII. du British Museum*, B. Haussoullier. Agrees with Mr. Kenyon that in the former of the two fragments above named we have a reference to Spartan institutions. *Servire*, R. Pichon. Two curious uses of this word in Seneca noticed. *Les Théâtres de Rome au temps de Plaute et de Térence*, P. Fabia. (1) Attempts to show that Rome had theatres with seats at latest towards the middle of the sixth cent. A.U.C. (2) Restores some verses to Plaut. which had been attributed to some obscure writers. *Remarques sur le texte de l'histoire de Crésus dans Hérodote*, E. Tournier. *Nouvelles notes critiques sur le texte de Tacite*, L. Constans. Various passages in the Agricola and the Annals noticed. *Quinte-Curce, III.* 1. 11, J. Keilhoff. Reads *quae continenti adhaeret, sed quia magna ex parte etc. Dèmes et tribus, patries et phratries de Milet*, B. Haussoullier. Information gathered from all the published inscriptions. *Un nouveau manuscrit des lettres de Sénèque dispersé entre Leyde et Oxford*, E. Chatelain. These letters are found up to 7, 2, in *Vossianus* F. 70, 1 at Leyden, and the rest in *Canonicianus* Lat. class. 279 at Oxford. The writing of the two MSS. is the same and of the tenth century. *Notes sur Thucydide*, E. Chambry. On various passages in Books I.–IV. *Mis, tis, honoris gratia* (*causa*), L. Havet. Remarks that in several passages of Plautus if we replace *mci* (*mihi*), *tui*, by *mīs, tīs*, respectively, the Plautine genitive of *ego* and *tu*, we restore the metre. τὸ μὴ et τοῦ μὴ, *question à propos d'Hérodote I.* 86, E. Tournier. Must we not here read τὸ μὴ καταkαυθῆναι, for τοῦ μὴ would give the opposite sense? *Sur un passage de Phèdre*, L. Duvau. In

iv. 9, 2, instead of M. Chauvin's correction in the last no., suggests *repente effugium quaerit alterius malo.*

Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik. Vol. 153. Part 12. 1896.

Verschollene länder des altertums, VI., K. Krauth. On the eastern tax-districts of Persia according to Herodotus and the Darius-inscriptions. *Zur Ilias*, R. Gaede. Maintains the authenticity of Σ 243–313. *Der froschmäuseskrieg bei Plutarch*, A. Gercke. Does not agree with Ludwich in his explanation of the two passages in Plutarch referring to this poem, which cannot be identified with the one we possess of this name. *Die Phoinissai des Euripides*, P. Voigt. It was the aim of Eur. to counsel the utmost self-sacrifice on the part of the Athenians in their struggle with Sparta. *Zu Catullus*, L. Polster. In 64, 108, 109 reads *illa procul radicitus exstirpata | prona cadit late, dumetis obvia frangens*, and in 96, 4 *mixtas* for *missas*. *Der wert des codex Gyraldinus für die kritik des Aetna*, L. Altzinger. This codex is played out as the 'best source.' For the foundation of the text we must have recourse to CS. (Cantabrigiensis and fragmentum Stabulense). *Zu Horatius*, E Schweikert. In Od. ii. 17, 25 alters the punctuation by putting a colon at *alas*, and a comma only at *sonum* in the next line. *Zu Livius Andronicus*, J. Tolkiehn. On a passage of Nonius in which a tragedy under the title of *Equos Trojanus* is ascribed to Livius.

Vol. 155. Part 1. 1897.

Das schlachtfeld im Teutoburger Walde. I, A. Wilms. A criticism on Knoke's view that the last camp of the Romans is to be found in the Habichtswald [see Cl. Rev. X. 407]. *Epigraphisches*, W. Schwarz. On two Egyptian inscriptions. *Zu Sophokles Aias*, C. Conradt. Elucidations of various difficult passages. *Zu Diophantos von Alexandreia*, F. Hultsch. The dedication of D's ἀριθμητικά contains part of two iambic lines. *Eine näherungsrechnung der alten poliorketiker*, F. Hultsch. Explains Polybius ix. 12 foll. by reference to Heron's περὶ διόπτρας. *Die Arvalbrüder*, E. Hoffmann. A criticism of Wissowa's article *Arvales fratres* in the new edition of Pauly. *Zu Vergilius Aeneis*, Ph. Loewe. In ii. 117 suggests *tendistis* for the text reading *venistis*. *Vertistis* has also been suggested. *De actorum in fabulis Terentianis numero et ordine*, M. Hodermann. *Zu Tacitus*, L. Polster. Critical notes on Hist. i. 52, i. 58, iv. 15, Ann. i. 35, and Germ. 29. *Die sechzehnte epode des Horatius*, Th. Plüss. Without the contradictions in this poem, it might be a masterpiece, and it is not, as Kiessling thinks, the work of a beginner.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN BOOKS.

Allcroft (A. H.) and J. H. Haydon, History of Rome, 31B. C.–96A. D. : the Early Principate. 2nd Ed. Crown 8vo. 270 pp. (Univ. Tut. Ser.) Clive. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Aristophanes. The Knights, adapted for performance by the Oxford Univ. Dramatic Society 1897. With English version adapted from that of J. H. Frere by L. E. Berman. 8vo. Frowde. 2*s.*

Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics, Books I.–V. (except 1, § 6) X, §§ 6–9. Translated by St. G. Stock. 2nd Ed. Crown 8vo. 116 pp. Oxford, Blackwell. 4*s.* 6*d*

Caesar. Gallic war, book VI. With introduction and notes by J. Brown. 12mo. 106 pp. Blackie. 1*s.* 6*d.*

Euripides. Alcestis, literally translated from Paley's text by H. Sharpley. Crown 8vo. 54 pp. Simpkins. 1*s.* 6*d.*

Greek Papyri Series. Ser. II. New classical fragments and other Greek and Latin papyri. Edited by B. F. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt. 4to. Frowde. 12*s.* 6*d.*

Hardmann (W. M.) and A. S. Walpole, Latin exercises for lower School Forms. 12mo. 184 pp. Longmans. 2*s.*

Harrison (Jane E.) Greek Art. Introductory studies. 4th Ed. 8vo. 324 pp., map, engravings. Unwin. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Hoppin (J. M.) Greek art on Greek soil. 8vo. viii, 254 pp., engravings. Boston. $ 2.

Xenophon. Anabasis, Book I. Edited with introduction, Vocabulary, Translation by A. H. Allcroft and F. L. D. Richardson. 2nd Ed. Crown 8vo. 152 pp. Clive. 3*s.*

FOREIGN BOOKS.

Apulcii (Lucii) Metamorphoseon libri XI. Recensuit J. van der Vliet. 12 mo. xxix, 292 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk.

Aristoteles. Ethique à Nicomaque, Livre X. avec de notes par G. Rodier. 8vo. 152 pp. Paris, Delagrave.

Barthélemy-Saint-Hilaire (J.) Socrate et Platon ou le Platonisme. 8vo. 57. Chartres.

Cicero. Zielinski (Th.) Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte. Ein Vortrag. iv, 102 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk. 40.

Corpus inscriptionum atticarum, consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae editum. Appendix. Defixionum tabellae atticae ed. R. Wuensch. Folio. xxxii, 52 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 9 Mk.

Curtius (E.) und J. A. Kauper, Karten von Attika. Pt. 9. Uebersichts-oder Gesammt-Karte von Attika. 9 sheets, 2 suppl. sheets, Title page. With Index. Fasc. 1. 4 sheets. 24 × 45, 5 ctm. Berlin, Reimer. 6 Mk. 40.

Friedersdorff (Fz.) Lateinische Schulgrammatik.

2nd Ed., with collaboration of H. Begemann. 8vo. vii, 204 pp. Berlin, Dümmler. 1 Mk. 80.

Heraclides. Voss (O.) De Heraclidis Pontici vita et scriptis. 8vo. 95 pp. Rostock. 2 Mk.

Homerus. Gedichte. B. II. Ilias. Kommentar von O. Henke. 8vo. iii, 329 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk. 40.

Hultsch (Fr.) Poseidonius und die Grösse und Entfernung der Sonne. 4to. 48 pp., engravings. Berlin, Weidmann. 3 Mk.

(Abhdlgn. der kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. New Series. Vol. I. Nr. 5).

Ludwich (A.) Kritische Miscellen I–XI. 4to. 20 pp. Königsberg. 60 Pf.

Platon's Phaedon. Mit Einleitung und Commentar von J. Stender. 8vo. x, 182 pp. Halle, Waisenhaus. 1 Mk. 50.

Plato. Dümmler (F.) Zur Composition des platonischen Staates mit einem Excurs über die Entwickelung der platonischen Psychologie. 4to. 34 pp. Basel.

—— Krieg (M.) Die Ueberarbeitung der Platonischen Gesetze durch Philipp v. Opus. 8vo. 40 pp. Freiburg, Herder. 1 Mk. 20.

Plinii Secundi (C.) Naturalis historia, post Lud. Jani obitum recogn. et auxit C. Mayhoff. Vol. IV. (Libri 23–30.) 12mo. x, 500 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 6 Mk.

Plutarchi Moralia, recogn. G. N. Bernardakis. Vol. VII. Plutarchi fragmenta vera et spuria continens. 12mo. lvi, 544 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 4 Mk.

—— the same. Epilogus. 12mo. 47 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk.

Prosopographia imperii romani saec. I. II. III. edita consilio et auctoritate academiae scientiarum regiae borussicae. (In 4 partibus.) Pars. I. Edidit E. Klebs. ix, 489 pp. Pars II. Ed. H. Dessau. v, 443 pp. Royal 8vo. Berlin, Reimer. 44 Mk.

Rehm (A.) Mythographische Untersuchungen über griechische Sternsagen. 8vo. 50 pp. München.

Reiske (Joh. Jac.) Briefe, herausgegeben von Rich. Foerster. 8vo. xvi, 928 pp. Leipzig, Hirzel. 30 Mk.

(Abhandlungen der philol.-historischen Klasse der k. sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften Vol. 16.)

Reitzenstein (R.) Geschichte der griechischen Etymologika. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Philologie in Alexandria und Byzanz. 8vo. ix, 408 pp., 2 plates. Leipzig, Teubner. 18 Mk.

Ridder (A. de.) De ectypis quibusdam aeneis quae falso vocantur 'argivocorinthiaca.' 8vo. 93 pp. Paris.

—— De l'idée de la mort en Grèce à l'époque classique. 8vo. viii, 204 pp. Paris, Fontemoing.

Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta, tertiis curis recogn. O. Ribbeck. 12mo. viii, 335 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 4 Mk.

Schmid (G.) De Archestrati Gelensis et Qu. Ennii fragmentis quibusdam. 8vo. 19 pp. St. Petersburg, Ricker. 1 Mk. 50.

Schneidewin (M.) Die antike Humanität. 8vo. xx, 558 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 12 Mk.

Sickel (Th. R. v.) Römische Berichte II. 8vo. 154 pp., 2 plates. Wien, Gerold. 3 Mk. 80.

(Aus Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie d. W.)

Sophocles. Pichler (F.) Beiträge zur Ueberlieferung der Sophoklesscholien. 8vo. 12 pp. Graz.

—— Vogl (F.) Beiträge zur Verständigung über Zahlensymmetrie und Responsion im sophokleischen Drama. 8vo. 26 pp. Ungarisch-Hradisch.

Stadtmüller (H.) Zu einigen Grabschriften der Palatinischen Anthologie und ihren Verfassern. 4to. 15 pp. Heidelberg.

Strack (Max L.) Die Dynastie der Ptolemaeer. 8vo. xvi, 294 pp. Berlin, Besser. 7 Mk.

Tacitus. Strobl (A.) Zur Schullectüre der Annalen des Tacitus. 8vo. 38 pp. Prag.

Terentianus. Werth (Alfr.) De Terentiani sermone et aetate. (Aus Jahrb. für class. Philol. Suppl. Vol. 23.) 8vo. 87 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk.

Thomas (E.) Rome et l'Empire aux deux premiers siècles de notre ère. 12mo. xii, 348 pp. Hachette.

Urbanus Bellunensis. Hilgard (A.) Des Urbanus von Belluno Institutionum in linguam Graecam grammaticarum libro duo. 4to. 6 pp. Heidelberg.

Varro. Agahd (R.) De Varronis Rerum Divinarum libris I. XIV. XV. XVI. ab Augustino in libris de civitate dei IV. VI. VII. exscriptis. 8vo. 38 pp. Leipzig.

Vergil. Cartault (A.) Etude sur les Bucoliques de Virgile. 8vo. 507 pp. Paris, Colin. 5 Fr.

—— Hunziker (R.) Die Figur der Hyperbel in den Gedichten Vergils. Mit einer einleitenden Untersuchung über Wesen und Einteilung der Hyperbel. 8vo. iv, 163 pp. Zürich.

Verrius Flaccus. Mackensen (L.) De Verri Flacci libris orthographicis. 8vo. 62 pp. Jena.

Viteau (J.) Etude sur le Grec du Nouveau Testament comparé avec celui de Septante. 8vo. v, 330 pp. Paris, Bouillon.

Vitruvius. Krohn (F.) Quaestiones Vitruvianae. Particula I. De M. Ceti Faventini epitoma. 8vo. 43 pp. Berlin, Mayer and M. 1 Mk. 20.

Wachsmuth (Curt.) Neue Beiträge zur Topographie von Athen. 8vo. 56 pp. Leipzig, Hirzel. 3 Mk.

(Aus 'Abhandlungen der k. sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften.')

Wölfflin (E. v.) Epigraphische Beiträge II. 8vo. 28 pp. München.

The Classical Review

MAY 1897.

DISCOVERY OF A COLLATION OF THE LOST 'CODEX TURNEBI' OF PLAUTUS.

I.

A Gryphius edition of Plautus (8vo. Lyons 1540) in the Bodleian Library has on the fly-leaf this entry: 'Hae notae in margine sunt manu Francisci Duareni Juriscons. celeberrimi ex ueteri Codice.' The margins are filled with variant readings by another hand, one series of which (beginning with v. 730 of the *Pseudolus* and extending over the *Poenulus*, *Persa* and the first half of the *Rudens*) is distinguished (though not by any means persistently) by the mark *dr.* from another series marked (in the same desultory fashion) *poict.*[1] The source of the readings marked *dr.* (occasionally *du.* and *do.*, which I interpret 'D(o)uareni') is indicated by a note in the margin of *Pseud.* 730 *sqq.*: 'Ex fragmentis monast(erii) S. Columnae (*leg.* Columbae) Senon(ensis) urbis Adriani Tornebi,' that is to say, a fragmentary MS. belonging to the Library of the Benedictine Monastery of Sainte Colombe at Sens, in the department of Yonne, used by the French scholar Adrien Turnèbe (1512–1565, Professor at Paris from 1547 till his death).

These 'Douaren'-readings are extremely good readings. They agree with *B*, the best of the minuscule MSS. of Plautus, against *CD*, the MSS. which take the second and third place. Not infrequently they are right alone, or in company with *A*, the Ambrosian Palimpsest, where *BCD* show an error or a lacuna. Here are a few samples:—

Poen. 770. Id nunc his cerebrum uritur.

(His cerebrum uritur *A*, hisce crebro auritur *CD*, *om. B*). (The Oxford copy has *his cerebrum utitur*, probably a miswriting of *uritur*).

Poen. 1355.

Numquid recusas contra me? Haud uerbum quidem.

(Haud uerbum quidem *A*, aduersum quidem *BCD*). (The Oxford copy has *had verbum quidem*, which was clearly the reading of the Archetype of *BCD*).

Pers. 587. Aequom hic orat.

(Aequm hic orat *A*, aequo mihi corat *B*, aequo mihi curat *CD*). (The immediate original of *BCD* seems to have had *aequo mhi* (*mihi*) *corat*. The Oxford copy shows *aequo hic orat*).

Pers. 705.

Quodsemelarripides Numquameripides: em tibi.

(Eripides em tibi *A*, eripi *BCD*). (The Oxford copy has *eripides ea tibi*. This last part of the line was unknown till the discovery of the Ambrosian Palimpsest in this century).

[1] Presumably the readings of a MS. from Poitiers. This MS. clearly had the ordinary 'Italian text' of Renaissance MSS; and its readings are of no value. The other mark, I may add, is certainly *dr.* not *tr.* ('Turnebus,' 'Torn-').

Poen. 1019.

Ad messim credo, nisi quid tu aliud sapis.

(Nisi quid tu aliud sapis *A*, nisi quidem tua *BD*, *deest C*). (The Oxford copy has *nisi quidem tu aliud sapis.* The ending of this line too was unknown till the Ambrosian Palimpsest was found).

Pers. 762.

Nam improbus est homo qui beneficium scit accipere et reddere nescit.

(Accipere *B*, sumere *CD*). (The Oxford copy agrees with *B*).

Rud. 519.

Eas : easque res agebam commodum.

(The Oxford copy reads with *A Eas easque*, while *BCD* agree in *Das easque*).

Specimens of lacunae in *BCD* which are supplied in the Oxford copy, but for which the evidence of *A* is lacking, are :—

Rud. 738.

Nam altera haec est nata Athenis *ingenuis* parentibus.

Here *B* has *athenis in e tibus*, *CD athenis sine tibus.*

Rud. 417.

Si mox uenies *uesperi* (si mox ueni is *CD*, si mox uenis *B*).

Rud. 686. Edepol *diem* hunc acerbum.

Rud. 166.

Neque gubernator umquam potuit *tam bene.*

Rud. 312.

Ut piscatorem aequomst, fame sitique speque *falsa* (spesque falsa).

Pers. 205.

Sophoclidisca, di me amabunt. Quid me? Utrum hercle *illis lubet* (iubet).

When I add that the symbols for 'diverbium' and 'canticum' occur at the beginning of some scenes in the Oxford copy, *e.g. Rud.* III. i. (Miris modis etc.) *DV*, *Pers.* II. v. (Paratum iam etc.) *C*, it will be sufficiently demonstrated that these marginal variants had their source in an actual MS. Further they seem to be free from conjectural emendation. At any rate, in various passages where this comes in, there is express statement of the fact. For example, at the line last quoted, *Pers.* 205, the marginal annotation runs : *quid me. P(aegnium) utrum hercle illis iubet verum iuuit*, implying that *iubet* was the reading of the MS., for which a conjectural emendation *iuuit* is suggested. At *Poen.* 1355 (quoted above) the note is : *AG(orastocles) had verbum quidem app(arenter) haud verbum.* The actual reading of the MS. *had verbum* has been scrupulously preserved. It is unlucky that the distinguishing marks of the good series (*dr.*) and the inferior series (*poict.*) are so often omitted. Still one is seldom in doubt about the series to which a variant should be referred. When two variants are given, the first is the reading of the Poitiers MS., the second the 'Douaren' reading. Where only one is given, the character of the variant generally entitles us to ascribe it without doubt to the one or the other source. The most serious defect of the collation is that it has evidently been copied from a modern (presumably sixteenth century) original, and that many mistakes have been made in the copying. A reference to the kindred MSS. (*BCD*) however usually enables us to detect a clerical error of the kind.

We are thus, it seems to me, entitled to regard these marginal variants as a fairly reliable collation of the famous 'codex Turnebi' (*T*), a MS. whose immense importance for the text is well known to all Plautine scholars. The few *T*-readings of these four plays which we already know from the *Adversaria* of Turnebus, such as *Poen.* 977 Punicast guggast homo, 1033 migdilix, *Pseud.* 738 hircum ab aliis (*leg.* alis), *Rud.* 613 fano meae uiciniae, 724 non licet <ita>, all reappear on the margin of the Oxford copy. The same is true of some noteworthy readings of the 'veteres libri' of Lambinus, and the 'vetus codex' of Scaliger, *e.g. Poen.* 977 (quoted above), 1204 addunt (*Lamb.* addant), 1355 (quoted above), *Pers.* 239 at [ita] uotita sum, 843 graphice, *Rud.* 417 (quoted above), 418 mane mulierem, *Rud.* 613 (quoted above); so that this newly found collation pronounces for the genuineness of these hitherto suspected readings. Indeed there are some grounds for supposing that Scaliger, and possibly also Lambinus (cf. *Rev. Phil.* xix. 256), derived them from the marginal entries of this very volume, or of a volume annotated in precisely similar fashion. In *Poen.* 384 *T*, like *A* and *B*, seems to have had the right reading *impias, ere, (here), te.* (Impia secrete *CD*), but in the

margin of the Oxford copy we find *impias fere te*, so carelessly written as to look like *impias ferile*. The 'vetus codex' of Scaliger had *impias herile!* In *Poen.* 718–9 the Gryphius text offers:—

> Ibique reliqua alia una fabulabimur.
> Equidem narrabo etc.

In the Oxford copy *una* is expunged, and in the margin *eadem* is written as a correction of *Equidem*, but without the usual stroke under the corrected word; so that a hasty reader, seeing *eadem* in the margin and a row of dots under *una*, might imagine that *eadem* was meant to be substituted for *una*. This is the reading of Scaliger's 'vetus codex': *alia eadem fabulabimur!* The Bodleian volume was certainly used by another Plautine scholar of France, namely Passerat. In a recent visit to the Bibliothèque Nationale, I found a Gryphius text of 1535 (Rés. p Y c 232) which had belonged to Passerat, and on whose margin that scholar had made a careful copy of the marginal annotations in the Bodleian Gryphius (of 1540). The relation between the two volumes is placed beyond doubt by the recurrence in Passerat's notes of entries like these: 'est in excuso an. 1540,' 'in alt. exc. an. 1540 a Gryphio,' 'in altero Gryphii,' as well as by the transcription of the variant for *Poen.* 63 as *qui*, whereas in the Oxford copy it is *quia*, clearly the right variant, with the last letter hidden by the initial letter of the next line. At the end of the volume Passerat gives the date of the completion of his task: 'an. 1557 mense Octob.;' so that the entries in the Oxford copy must have been made at some time between 1540 and 1557. Douaren was at Paris from 1548 for a time, and it is conceivable that he obtained the collation from his friend Turnèbe and took a copy of it during that period. Unfortunately there seems to be no specimen of Douaren's handwriting in the Bibliothèque Nationale, so that it is impossible to be certain that the Oxford marginal entries are actually from Douaren's hand. The fact however that the note on the fly-leaf is in a different hand from the marginalia themselves is strongly in favour of this supposition. The Oxford volume bears two owners' names: 'Publii Coronae Taboroti' (*i.e.* Étienne Tabourot 1549–1590) and 'R. Belleau' (possibly Tabourot's friend, Remy Belleau 1528–1577, or a descendant). It passed into the Bodleian from the library of Bishop Barlow, died 1691, among whose books are several relics of French scholars of the 16th century.[1] That this Gryphius text was at one time in the possession of P. Pithou is suggested by a note of Passerat's prefixed to an Aldine Plautus (Venice 1522) in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Rés. m Y c 371), a volume of which an account was recently given by M. Paul Le Breton[2] in the *Revue de Philologie* (1895, vol. xix. p. 255). Passerat has made it a receptacle for the collations of no less than nine MSS., of which he gives us a careful account in a prefatory note, and whose readings he distinguishes by different coloured ink. The marginal variants of his Gryphius copy he here describes as the collation of three MSS., taken from a Plautus, lent him by P. Pithou (Petrus Pithoeus nobis commodavit Plautum emendatum a capite ad calcem comparatione trium veterum librorum). He does not, however, say that the collation had been written by P. Pithou himself; and the writing in the Oxford copy (probably, as we have seen, Douaren's handwriting) is unlike P. Pithou's style of penmanship.[3] Indeed since P. Pithou was born in November 1539, he would be barely eighteen years old when Passerat transcribed the collation (Oct. 1557). The third MS. used (if the real number was three) may have been one containing the first eight plays in the ordinary 'Italian recension,' but this point I have not yet fully investigated. I see no ground for believing it to have been a MS. of any value.

A more important point to determine is the extent of the 'Codex Turnebi' or, as we may now call it, the 'Fragmenta Senonensia.' The good readings, normally marked 'D(ua)-r(eni),' in the Oxford volume extend, as I have said, from *Pseud.* 730 over the rest of that play, the whole of the two following, the

[1] One is an Aldine edition of Spartianus etc. (Auct. II. R. VI. 54), which formerly belonged to the Pithou library (cf. Boivin, p. 97). Another is a Dousa text of Plautus (Auct. S. 5. 21) which formerly belonged to Joseph Scaliger and is filled with his annotations (cf. de Larroque, p. 341). I hope to write about this latter volume on a future occasion.

[2] M. Le Breton has made a careful copy of this 'variorum' collation of Passerat, and was so obliging as to let me have the use of it for an edition of Plautus, which I am preparing. His copy has been of very great service to me in deciphering the entries in the Oxford volume. The discovery that the 'codex Turnebi' was a Sens MS. really belongs to him; for in his article in the *Revue de Philologie* he quotes from Passerat's Aldine the entry (at *Pseud.* 730): 'Ex fragmentis . . . urbis,' and calls attention to the fact that the subsequent variants are *T*-readings. The Oxford Gryphius, where the entry appears in full: 'Ex fragmentis . . . Adriani Turnebi,' removes the last possibility of doubt.

[3] I am indebted for this information, and for a great deal of other help, to the courtesy of M. Dorez of the Bibliothèque Nationale.

Poenulus, and *Persa*, and the first half of the next, the *Rudens*.[1] They appear also in certain parts of the *Bacchides*; from v. 35, the beginning of the play in the Palatine MSS., to about v. 80, from about v. 570 to about v. 650, and from about v. 810 to about v. 900 (*e.g.* v. 36 *fugiet* Do[uar]; v. 602 *oportet scutum integumentum improbust*; v. 887 *verbinast*). Douaren's collation thus makes us think of the 'fragmenta Senonensia' as a compact fragment containing the last part of the *Pseudolus* and nearly the whole of the three following plays, with loose leaves of the *Bacchides*, possibly inserted for security in some part of it. These leaves we may suppose to have been (1) a single leaf, perhaps the first of a quaternion, (2) two broad sheets, perhaps the second and third (*i.e.* the second, third, sixth, and seventh leaves) of another quaternion. It seems natural to imagine that Douaren, when he was about it, would have written out the full collation of the 'codex Turnebi'; but on the other hand we, find in Turnebus' *Adversaria* (published in 1564) readings quoted from this codex (aliquot membranae quas aliquando habui) for passages of other plays, notably the *Casina*. It is possible that a marginal note in the Oxford copy for v. 75 of the *Menaechmi* comes from the good MS.: alibi in alio codice inuenitur textus sequens 'Ni caditat leno modo.'[2] And the variants for *Amph.* 342 (alias 'qui pugnis os exossas hominibus') and *Men.* 391 (bexeae) belong to the better type of MSS. What parts of the 'codex Turnebi' the 'Duarenus' collation omits and how far the readings from the 'vetus codex' of Scaliger and the 'veteres libri' of Lambinus supply the deficiency, is a question that demands a careful investigation.

Lastly, with regard to the relation of the 'codex Turnebi' (*T*) to the other minuscule MSS., the impression left on my mind after a study of the 'Duarenus'-readings is that *T* stood to *B* in the same relation as *B* to *CD*. *BCD*, I take it, are derived from an Archetype written in Capitals, *B* and the original of *CD* being immediate copies of a minuscule copy (*P*) of this archetype. *T* is not a copy of *P*, which had, for example, in *Poen.* 471 *lenutte* (*B*) or *lenuite* (*CD*), where the Oxford copy has *lenuile*, while Turnebus professes to have found in his codex the true reading *lenulle*; and whose scribe had left out deliberately or accidentally words and parts of lines, *e.g.* in *Poen.* 977 the (to him) unintelligible half-line quoted above, *Punicast guggast homo*. *T* comes however from the same archetype (in capitals) as *BCD* and seems in passages like *Poen.* 1355 (already quoted) to retain the exact text of the archetype unaltered. A good many corrupt readings, formerly ascribed, on the strength of the agreement of *BCD*, to the ancient archetype of the Palatine family of MSS., are now shown by this collation of Douaren to be mere mistakes of the immediate original of *BCD*.

This point however, like all the points raised in this article, demands a detailed inquiry, accompanied by a full presentation of the 'Douaren' readings. I hope to publish this with as little delay as possible. In the meantime, that students of Plautus may not have to wait for information about the more valuable additions to our critical apparatus, I propose to print at once the more important of the 'Douaren' readings for the five plays. The readings for the *Rudens* will be found specially interesting.

W. M. Lindsay.

Oxford.

[1] This is the regular order of these plays in the Palatine family of MSS., and in the early printed editions.

[2] Douaren, or whoever was the writer of these marginalia, has stopped abruptly without finishing the passage, which ought to proceed 'adulescens, modo senex, Pauper, mendicus, rex, parasitus, hariolus.' He does the same with *Pseud.* 1051, writing merely *Ita ac triumphi*, and no more.

LUCANUS.

Ad censuram W. E. Heitland, *Class. Rev.* Febr. 1897, P. 25, *sqq.*

In fasciculo supra laudato p. 35 Lucani a me editi (Lugd. Bat. A. W. Sythoff) censura exstat Heitlandi Viri Doct. in qua haec verba invenio: I cannot find this (that Francken has used VU himself) directly stated. Etsi hoc effici potest e Praefatione, tamen e re esse putavi, ne quod dubium superesset, diserte monere me inde a d. 18 Dec. 1886 usque ad 28 Martii 1887 et d. 1 Julii usque ad 31 Jul. 1889, utrumque

MS.: V (Voss. Lat. Q. 51) et U (Voss. Lat. Fol. 63) ipsum contulisse. Addo collationes meas non esse ulla parte secundum Steinhartum (cuius collatio prodiit in Hosii editione a. 1892) mutatas aut truncatas, ne iis quidem locis, ubi error commissus potuisset explicari. Idem factum in Montepessulano: dedi quae ante Steinharti curam editam ego ex M., familares mei *Dr. J. van Wageningen*, et *Dr. M. A. Kreling* e Montepessulano Ashburnhamensi, Gemblacensi notavimus. Meae collationes testimonii vim habent non sunt consarcinatae nec contaminatae.

Hoc affirmare Heitlando fortasse non superfluum videbitur; de quibusdam locis, ubi discrimen est aut esse videtur inter Steinhartum et me, quaerit, nec sine causa, utri fidem habeat; hos subiungam; aliorum quoque interest scire.

P. 36. Luc. iii. 19 ego:

rumpentes stamina M. *i.e. es* et *a* posterior in rasura.

Hosius (sequens Stht.): rumpenti stamine M^1, *i.e.* in rasura antea scriptum erat id quod dicit. Haec nota enim M^1, significat lectionem primitivam nunc deletam et sub rasura latentem. Istiusmodi lectionum erasarum penes Steinhartum fides esto, qui codici liquorem adhibuit, aut melius affectum manu versavit. Cf. Praef. mea I. p. xii. Nihil est obscuri aut discriminis.

P. 37. Luc. i. 448.

Textus in mea edit.: demittitis, var. lect.: dimittitis VU.

Hosius in textu: dimittitis, var. lect.: demittitis V, itaque U (ex sil.) dimittitis, discrimen est igitur in V, cui ego dimittitis, Stht. demittitis adscribit. In collatione mea secundum Burmannianam facta supra *de* scripta est *i* rubra, itemque *i* nigra tinctura, *i.e.* V et U habent: dimittitis.

I. 463 crinigeros, post hoc voc. in var. lect. excidit: O.

De reliquis in VU dubiis consului Doct. *S. G. de Vries*, successorem Doct. *W. H. du Rieu*, isque, qua est humanitate, locos a me indicatos contulit maxima diligentia, litteras non tam scribens quam pingens. Vid. tabula adiecta.[1] Ex ea haec efficiuntur:

I. 120 mea ed. in var. lect. recte: *est addit U;* tacet Stht., *est* in textu Hosius om.

254 *vid. infra.*

580 *et medio* ego in textu, in var. lect. 'e medio A'; *e medio* recte in textu sine var. Hos. *Et* in meo textu haesit, quod doleo, e Weisiana, quam correctam operis dederam exprimendam.

604 adtollensque ego in textu, in var. lect.: 'et tollens V', *i.e.* e silentio: attollensque U; Hos.: et tollens in textu, in var. lect.: 'attollensque U', *i.e.* ex sil.: et tollens V. Nihil differt.

633 ego in textu: viscera, in var. lect. recte: pectora V, pectore U; Hos. in textu: pectora, in Var. Lect.: pectore u (voluit: in ras. U); ex sil. sequitur pectora VU, non prorsus recte.

Denique 642 in var. lect. aliquid turbatum est. Vides Steinhartum, qui aetatem trivit in codicibus conferendis, non magis quam me vacasse errore. Qui ipsi codices contulerunt sciunt, quam sit difficile, praesertim ubi plures conferuntur, ab omni vitio cavere. Plerique diligentiam conferentis explorare non possunt; raro enim datur duas collationes a diversis collatoribus eodem fere tempore factas, ut in Lucano, inter se conferre.

'Curiosum' (a curious instance) sibi invenire visus est Heitlandus i. 254, ubi ego: furentem VU, Hos.: ruentem V furentem U *vid.* nota (1). Omnis haec 'curiosa' varietas in eo est, quod Stht. de V fallitur, ut cuivis potest accidere; in quo facile est tragoedias excitare, praesertim si ipse codices non conferas.

Benevolus lector animadvertet ad v. 101 et 103 eadem vocabula *male VU* (*Stht.*) errore bis posita esse. Pertinent ad 101. Scilicet Steinhartus primus vidit in medio vocabulo quod est *mare* in utroque libro exstare non *r* sed *l*. Mirum Cortium in ed. 1726 hoc ipsum *male* contra omnes MSS., ut dicit, coniectura assecutum esse, id ipsum in duobus codd. postea inventum et tamen—falsum esse. Burmannus iam satis Cortium refutavit et nollem rursus *male* ab Hosio revocatum.

Antequam ad exegetica transeo, non abs

[1] LUCANI PHARSALIA I.

	Voss. Lat. Q. 51. (V).	Voss. Lat. Fol. 63. (U).
I. 120 permissum est *an* perm. [est]	Permissū ducibus	Pmissū ducib; (est m. 2)
254 ruentem *an* furentem	furentē	furentē
580 et medio *an* e medio	e medio	emedio
604 et tollens *an* attollensque	Et tollens	Attolensq;
633 pectore *an* pectora *an* viscera	pectora	pectore (e *in ras*)
642 nulla sine, nulla cum, *an* ulla (s. l.)	nulla cum lege	nulla sine lege

(Dr. S. G. de Vries.)

re erit animadvertisse codices AF, aliosque ab Hosio passim inspectos in meum apparatum non receptos esse, quia parum noti et raro adhibiti essent. In notis codicum autem A habet diversam significationem apud Hosium et me. Nota illa apud Hosium significat *Adnotationes*, scholia quaedam in cod. Bernensi xxxxv ab Usenero collata et ad Commentum adhibita, quae in Vossianis quoque VU et Berol. exstant, de quo (quod virum, etiam doctum fugisse non mirum est) exposuit Usenerus ad comm. p. viii. Mihi et doct. P. Lejay (ed. 1[i] libri Par. 1894) A est Ashburnhamensis, isque usus litterae A facile recipietur, quod *Adnotationes* descriptae ex codd. exstantibus, scholiis inde aliquando editis, exiguum pretium habebunt.

Gravis calamitas, si Heitlandum audimus, imminet criticae emendatrici. Nam quia duae sint familiae codicum, lectiones in omnibus codd. similes poetae manum repraesentare dicit; fieri non potuisse ut mendum idem casu in utramque perveniret. Est haec quaestio non tam nova quam parum explorata in universum; quisque editor habet suam de ea re opinionem; pertinet illa ad ipsa elementa criticae disciplinae, sed tam simplex plerisque videtur, ut operae pretium non habeant de ea data opera in prooemiis editionum disserere. Si Heitlandus vere statuit, omnia opera, quae pluribus codicibus in summa re non diversis inter se prodita sunt, exemta erunt e provincia emendatricis critices, cuius dignatio et aestimatio valde imminuentur; adhibebitur enim, si forte conceditur, Velleio Paterculo, Apuleio, Silio, ceterum diplomatica in locum emendatricis succedet, palaeographia, quatenus frequentia vitia ad classes redigit et probabilitatem erroris ostendit, amandari poterit, Dindorfiis, Gronoviis, Valckenaeriis, Porsonis raro opus erit; dura lex, sed lex.

Interim aliquot tamen opportunitates exercendae coniecturalis criticae superesse Heitlandus fatetur. Quae in utraque classe (μ et ϕ) adsunt debent *non nisi gravissimis causis* mutari p. 42[c]. *Quaedam* igitur corrupta sunt. Factum est igitur ut in ambas familias idem mendum penetraret, raro, sed factum. Sed quod *potuit* semel fieri, potuit saepius.

Ubi rerum testimonia adsunt, verbis non opus est. Num consensus codicum in Ciceronis orationibus, ut hoc utar, vacat vitio? Ab posse ad esse valet consequentia. Quod in bene multis operibus factum videmus, non negari debet in ullo fieri potuisse.

Sed tamen rationi credendum est; *demonstrare* se putat vir doctissimus vix aut ne vix quidem mendum potuisse irrepere, cedat demonstrationi *probabilitas*, si modo demonstratum erit id quod demonstrandum erat.

Duae familiae paulum differunt, ergo continent manum auctoris. Quae illa est demonstratio? Sunt similes inter se, habent igitur eandem originem. Rectissime. Sed accedere aliquid debet: ea origo est manus poetae aut poetae proxima.

Unde hoc efficies? Codices sunt optimi, fateor, nemo labore collationis me magis ostendit, se eos magni facere; sed supra aetatem Carolingicam non adscendunt. Est inter poetae aetatem sive primam editionem Pharsaliae et antiquissimos nostros codices intercapedo octo saeculorum, qua quid factum sit, non scimus. Facile et gratis sumitur, quomodo e manu primi editoris provenerint volumina, sic ad medium aevum pervenisse. Me iudice ipse contextus ostendit naevos tot tantosque, ut magnopere de eo dubitandum sit.

Etsi successio codicum ultra saec. ix. nos fugit, tamen quaedam de fatis librorum ex aevo antiquo nobis sunt tradita.

Gellius ii. 3, 5 miraculi instar memorat volumen exstitisse aetatis Vergilianae, *i.e.* 200 annorum; si non ultra ducentos annos codices servati sint, per octo saecula habemus iam quatuor codicum aetates. Intentissima cura amanuensis vitia praeverti non possunt. Queritur Cicero, admodum mendose codices scribi.

Sed aberrandum non est. Palimpsestus Romanus et Neapoli-Vindobonensis, scripti saec II—V, contextum habent, quo hodie nolles uti. Quae causa est igitur, cur existimemus quos hodie habeamus codices liberos corruptelis traditos esse? Contrarium probabile est. Nihil ex duarum familiarum magna similitudine inter se demonstrari potest nisi ante saec. ix. exstitisse recensionem, nostris codicibus fere similem. Quam antiquus fuerit communis ille fons, definiri non potest. In altera ex his propagine omissi sunt versus, qui in communi fonte aderant, quosque non improbabile est tanquam dittographias antiquissimas fuisse notatos.

Ex prima antiquitus editione tanquam fonte rivuli in omnes partes emissi sunt. Bibliopolae ut satisfacerent empturientium desideriis magnum numerum exemplorum confiiciendum curabant, nec erant vulgares lectores valde studiosi emendatae lectionis. Apparet e Martiale xiv. 194 et palimpsestis. Non pacto aut convento evanescunt vocabula, et tamen ea videmus quasi communi consensu expelli e consuetudine; in libris eligendis et reiciendis valuerunt aeque ludibria temporum. Quae sequuntur reliqua a

coniectura pendent. Nempe ex hac fluctuatione ac varietate maior stabilitas nata esse potest, quomodocunque tandem, sive Sosii sive Aristarchi alicuius opera sed ea non mansit semper. Ultimo enim imperii Romani saeculo modesta opera virorum doctorum et clarissimorum Horatii et aliorum auctorum emendationes confectae sunt. Quomodo tamen factum sit, ut una quaedam aut, si forte, duae tales emendationes omnes reliquas obscuraverint, iuxta cum ignorantissimis ignoro. Sed ut verborum sic librorum vetus interit aetas. Nec ulla causa est cur statuamus permagnum fuisse numerum codicum, qui ex antiquitate ad medium aevum salvus evaserit.

Ut res se nunc habet, non est cur aut Heitlandus e modo traditionis contendat Lucanum integrum, aut ego corruptum totum ad nos pervenisse. Hoc ex ipsa ratione carminis effici debet, prudenter et sine praeiudicio exploranda. In quo ecquid effecerim iudicium integris iudicibus relinquo. Non mihi conscius sum, me prurigine novandi motum esse; dum mea scripta considero, tam subinde obrepit cogitatio, num quaedam male affecta iniuria defenderim, quam altera, num emendatio proposita digna fuerit, quae cunctorum oculis subiceretur; de necessitate correctionis tentandae raro etiamnunc dubito.

Quidquid est, interpretatio carminis fundamentum erit critices. Admodum deprecor, ne Heitlandus me magistri cuiusdam partes stolida arrogantia affectare dicat. Nusquam fere quidquam tanquam non latinum damnavi, hoc tantummodo quaerens, num tradita forma loci talis esset, ut intellegi et placere posset aequalibus poetae, quorum consuetudinem litterarum luce collustratam satis novimus. In quo non tanti facio duo momenta, quae Heitlandus cum plerisque urguet.

1. We must never forget that the poem before us is the work of an immature genius, Heitl. p. 42.

Iure, sed quae inde consequantur, diligenter est definiendum. Primo non erat puer sed adolescens 20 annorum poeta cum priorem partem carminis conficeret, quam in Neroneis A.D. 60 recitavit, natus A.D. 39; alteram, libros iv.–x., composuit inter annos aetatis 21–24. Eae proprietates, quae faciunt poetam, celeres ingenii motus et phantasia, in adolescente omnino dominantur magis quam in viro; iuvenilis aetas non parit per se obscuritatem; fervor ingenii suggerit vocabula grandia et luxuriam figurati amplique sermonis: inde vaga facile nascitur oratio, dum metaphorae sunt frequentes et crebrae et non elaboratae. Fervore ingenii, quod modo arripuit iuvenis poeta, mox nondum perfectum mittet, nova phantasia motus. Inde saepe exultat oratio potius, quam incedit et vincula membrorum desiderantur. Ceterum eligit poeta sermonem, quo sensus mentis facillime effundat, i.e. patrium suum, qui tanquam naturae donum fluit facile et pullulat. Obscurus esse potest iuvenis poeta inventorum granditate et affluentia, peccare in linguam ex inopia et ignorantia sermonis non magis potiusve iuveni accidit quam viro. Iuvenes videbis facilius saepe et celerius loqui quam viros; verba eis affluunt. Si qui cum sermone luctari videntur, non sunt potissimum iuvenes. Quia Lucanus adolescens aut iuvenis est, non propterea debet durus aut ambiguus esse.

2. (The poem) was confessedly transmitted to later times in an unfinished state.

Non est id sine exceptione verum: tres libri sunt. Quod si quaeritur, num inter hos et septem reliquos ad nitorem et perfectionem magnopere intersit, valde equidem affirmare vereor; oratio Catonis in priore parte non est magis expers cohaerentiae quam Pompeii in altera, enumeratio Galliae copiarum aeque dissoluta in priore quam regionum Thessaliae in altera. Pluribus in hac brevitate supersedeo. Sine dubio emendaturus erat poeta postremos libros, ut Vacca putat, sed hoc quoque me iudice certum, illum experturum fuisse primum impetum in poesi vulgo optimum esse. Si quis existimat correctum a poeta carmen perspicuitate multo superius fuisse futurum, contendit aliquid quod collata priore eius parte admodum controversum est.

Aliud est huic affine, quod Heitlandum tamen non significare puto; volo editionem ex volumine poetae festinanter scripto et, ut fit, interdum mutato, factam ab editore manus auctoris aut amanuensis fortasse non satis gnaro utique ad errorem proclivo; inde mendae nasci potuerunt omnia futura exemplaria inquinantes. De hoc genere alibi actum, sed sequitur ex his quoque, fata Pharsaliae omnino talia esse, ut nulla causa sit, cur patienter pro genuinis accipiamus quidquid nobis apponitur. Equidem non praeditus sum stomacho tam capaci. Lib. i. 461 dicuntur Druidarum 'animae—capaces | mortis.' Ut *capaces* defendat Doct. Heitlandus provocat ad versionem: able to contain or receive death = ready for death. Non video quid 'capax mortis' sit aliud nisi 'qui capiat mortem.' Ipsa quidem mors non transit in animum, sed notio mortis capax mortis animus est: *satis magnus* ad mortem tenendam; is qui eum habet mortem animo *concipit*;

est ea laus philosophi; Heitlandus ut hoc redarguat interpretatur 'able to contain or receive death = ready for death.' Mihi illud *able to receive* inesse vocabulo non videtur; *capax* pertinet opinor ad 'capacitatem' non ad 'celeritatem'; et tamen verba conversa admodum blandiuntur. TC. v. 453 'nemora alta remotis | incolitis lucis' (ego: 'remotos lucos'). Heitland: Ye dwell in the depth of woodlands among the retired sacred groves.' Habemus poetam pro interprete. Credisne quia ornatis verbis periphrasis concipi possit, propterea sanam esse traditam lectionem? Egregie noverunt et Heitlandus et Haskinsius artificium poeticae orationis, est versio eorum quasi fragmentum Miltoni aut Wordsworthi; ego contendo: 'versio semper est inversio.' Sententia primitiva speculo mentis repercutitur, sed interpres, qui alia lingua *i.e.* alio instrumento utitur, e suo pecu quaerit verba affinia, grandia saepe et elegantia, non opinor quin vulgaribus possit uti, sed discipulorum causa, qui sic concilientur poetae. Interim multa in duabus linguis vocabula non se plane 'tegunt,' quod aiunt; invito interprete excidit aliquid quod vix continet, umbram dicam an colorem, primitivae sententiae; et facilius eo aberratur, si aliquot verba inseruntur ex animo interpretis et offeruntur lenocinia verborum mutata sententia. Nolo reprehendere, sed haec ad defensionem traditae lectionis non sufficiunt.

Pauca ad defensionem mearum emendationum addo.

P 37 'Parvum (subst.) sanguinis' I. 128 defendit H. damnat meum *paulum s.*, quia magnus Thesaurus latinitatis in Germania qui fortasse exemplum aliud praebere possit, nondum prodiit (rusticus expectassem), et quia fieri possit, ut vulgaris consuetudo sic locuta fuerit. Non admodum probabile ubi agitur de vocabulo usitato per aetatem litterarum luce collustratam.

I. 429 Varietas lectionis in M satis implicata non potest clarius indicari, et ipse H. mea compendia recte intellegens reapse ostendit me iustis desideriis satisfacere. Mea annotatio de *foedere* omissa est.

P. 38 I. 456 librum H. obicit me MS. P laudare, h. l. qui nullus ad hunc librum mihi praesto fuerit. P = Proverbia. Cf. indiculus praemissus.

I. 16 Dies medius flagrantibus aestuat horis. Non satis videor perspicuus fuisse. Num post verba: 'medius dies flagrat' interrogabit aliquis: quando? Si talis quaestio *non* est supervacanea, *horis* recte se habet.

102 'Nec patitur conferre fretum (duo maria).' Caesar et Pompeius conferuntur cum mari Supero et Infero, quae aliquamdiu Isthmo quodam Messanae erant separata inter se; tanquam Isthmus ille, Crassus socerum et generum, *i.e.* duo freta separaverat. Primum sepono ab H. allatum ii. 435 qui locus minime convenit. Porro ut Bentleianum *gradum* (pro: fretum) defendam, animadverto notionem *duorum*, non unius freti, necessariam esse, sine qua comparatio claudicet. Magis etiam *fretum* alienum est, quia id non collectivum est, nec impetum significat aut simile quid abstractum. Duo erant olim freta separata, *i.e.* Pompeius et Caesar. Duo erant olim freta (gulfs) ad mare Superum et Inferum. Inficetum non tantum est, sed testatur ignorationem verae sententiae, si fretum dicitur conferri cum gladio; gladio numquam tanquam intervallo separantur pugnantes. Non probo: conferre fretum is a figurative application used of two seas meeting face to face with their waters. Egregie Bentleius *gradum*. Exiguum spatium inter duos gladiatores gladio decertantes et extento pede in statu permanentes comparatur cum aggere (isthmo) inter duo maria.

115 *Furentem* patrem et virum retinere a certamine dicitur melius esse quam *furentes*, while (Julia would) hold them (father and husband) back one by one, work on their feeling separately. Nimis acute! Ita etiam iudico de defensione lectionis '*discussa* fides' (119). De arcu cum quo amicitia comparetur secundum Heitlandum nec vola est nec vestigium. *Discutere* est: '*quaquaversus* pellere' hoc neglegitur.

186 *Ingens* est quod vulgarem modulum superat et eo horrorem, metum aut admirationem incutit. Quanto aptius amoris h. l. significatio (lugens) quam illud vagum et vacuum *ingens;* eo loco praecipue versus et de patria quidem: 'lugens visa duci Patriae trepidantis imago.'

262 *Mens* iv. 704 est animi affectio (Stimmung), vii. 183 abstracte dicitur: 'mentis tumultus' ut dicimus 'corporis dolores.' Ubi de singulorum animis agitur, pluralem videbis usurpatum vii. 180, al.— Schol. Oudend. ut haec extricaret, bis ponit *addunt*, quia optime intellegebat vel post logicam periodi constructionem nexum obscurum esse.

294 *sq.* 'Iam carcere clauso' Heitlandus dicit esse ablativum loci. Abundat igitur *clauso?* Immo *clausus iam* (etiamtunc) in stabulo equus impatiens iam est morae. Cum *clauso* minime iungi potest *iam*. Hoc fieret recte, si carceris claudendi actio soleret *sequi* ('wenn der carcer schon geschlossen ist.')

Iam, opinor, est maturata actio: iam ante iustum tempus equus trepidat.

316 Si erravi defensio Heitlandi utique placere mihi non potest: much of Lucan's rhetoric is in bad taste. Non comparatur Pompeius cum pusione.

372 Quidquid quis vult harioletur numquam tamen ostendet non esse absurdum (serio dictum) 'necesse mihi est posse' (debeo posse).

407 *Monoecum* pro *Monoeci* ('tuta prohibet statione Monoecum'), invitus ipse, defendit Heitlandus allato vi. 503, ubi tellus *prohibet* lunam fraterna imagine *i.e.* lunam privat sole.

432 *Pererrare* potest, secundum analogiam aliorum cum *per* compositorum, absolute usurpari sed alio significatu quam qui h. l. aptus est, nempe cum notatur: ad finem usque.

486 'Curia et ipsa.' Wanton change! Heitlandus; interim Bauerus mihi assentitur. Sic supra quoque (333) *tandem* contra H. Curia et ipsi patris dicitur si patres aliud quid sunt quam curia.

544 'Induxere sibi noctem Mycenae' 'far the better' (is the vulg. *duxere*). Nempe si diceretur 'trahunt post se noctem' aut 'sensim ad se ducunt,' quomodo est apud Stat. Ach. ii. 21 ubi de Scyro insula ex oculis navigantium sensim discedente 'ardua ducere nubes | incipit—Scyros.' Sed Mycenae prae horrore, ut homo faciem tegit, sic induit caliginem.

555 Mare 'summum implevit Atlanta' defendit Heitlandus: 'implevit = rose to the top of it.' Hoc (sit venia verbo) non est *vertere* sed *substituere* aliud vocabulum. Permittamus hyperbolen Lucano, sed *implere* est: congerere aliquid in rem cavam; quod non cadit in cacumen montis.

600 '*Revocare* imaginem deae flumine' non recte illustratur Vergiliano 'victu revocare vires,' hae abisse et deinde redire cogitantur, Deae imago non fingitur aufugisse. Munus sacerdotum Cybeles erat purgare imaginem fluvio Almone h. e. *renovare*. Praeterea ipsi sacerdotes ibant, non revocabant; abeuntes revocamus, non abductos et inanima.

Nolo plura afferre ne intemperantius spatio abutar. Sit tamen locus illustrandae metaphorae, quae est ii. 140–3, ubi caedes Sullana comparatur cum sectione medici modum excedente: 'excessit medicina modum nimiumque secuta est qua morbi duxere manum,' ubi libri *manus*. Facete dolet Heitlandus ne hoc quidem sibi relictum solatium, nam ex Augustino CD. iii. 27 me adscivisse *manum*. Obiter animadvertatur ne antiquam quidem auctoritatem sufficere Heitlando, nisi cum codd. Lucani conveniat. Sed ad rem accedo. Quid est 'manus sequitur medicinam' (ut vulgo), nisi manus persequitur, efficit, curationem, consectatur loca morbida et quae curatione indigeant. Hoc non est quod dictum est superiore versu 'excessit medicina modum.' Ita manus medici suo officio fungitur. Potestne hoc nimis facere? In altera lectione sententia est medicina *i.e.* sectio, amputatio noxiorum, veluti carcinomatum, producta est pro facultate aut fastu operantis. Amputatio extenta est. Manus occupata semel in amputando non quievit, sed successu gaudens et peritia ostentanda etiam vitalia attigit.

De orthographia fortasse Heitlando satisfaciet praefatio vol. ii. Alterius Vossiani (U) quam desiderat imaginem suppeditabit fasc. 12 operis 'Palaeographie des Class. Lat.' ed. Chatelain, qui paucos ante dies prodiit.

C. M. Francken.

Traiecti ad Rhenum,
M. Aprili, 1897.

THE DATE OF TYRTAEUS.

It may perhaps be expected by readers of the *Classical Review*, and by Mr. Macan, that I should state here, whether I am convinced or moved by the observations on my treatment of this subject, which he has done me the honour to make (*supra* p. 11). To the proposition which formed the base or kernel of my previous paper (vol. x. p. 269), that the orator Lycurgus associated the story of Tyrtaeus with the Messenian war of the fifth century (*circa* 464–454 B.C.), Mr. Macan gives a single paragraph, and concludes that the contrary is manifest. It would seem at this rate that I ought to have little difficulty in recognizing my mistake; and silence could hardly be taken otherwise than as an ungracious acknowledgment. As a fact, the paragraph leaves me (I say it with all respect) precisely where I stood before. It does not affect, because it does not touch at

all or pretend to touch, that part of Lycurgus' exposition, by which, as I thought and think, his opinion on the date of Tyrtaeus is made clear. The paragraph deals only with another part, which by itself would prove nothing precise upon the point, being dependent for its chronological definition on that part which the paragraph ignores.

But as the purpose of discussion is to promote agreement, and not to accentuate differences, let me first note with pleasure the impression which has evidently been made upon Mr. Macan by my remarks on the impossibility of assigning to the date of the supposed early 'Messenian wars', and to an origin in Sparta at that time, the poetry which bears the name of Tyrtaeus. For it should be observed that, in this respect at least, all of it stands on the same footing. In language, form, and style all the extant fragments are similar, nor is there (so far as I am aware) the slightest indication that the fourth century B.C, or any other age, claimed to possess any 'Tyrtaeus' of a different quality,—that is to say, any Tyrtaeus which, as a matter of fact, could have been composed for the Lacedaemonian public, or popular among Lacedaemonians, in 680 B.C. or anywhere near that date. Of all important Hellenic peoples the Lacedaemonians were, according to general testimony, the last to acquire such a diffused popular culture of the intelligence as would be needed for the general appreciation of literature cast in foreign forms and a foreign dialect. The very passage of Lycurgus, which we are to consider, shows that, even down to the fourth century, that great classical literature, which ruled in Athens and elsewhere, had still no general vogue in Lacedaemonia, and that the public there, in spite of Tyrtaeus and his educational reforms, still went, in 'the poets' recognized by Athens, little beyond the Lacedaemonian school-book, the compositions of Tyrtaeus himself. In the early part of the seventh century, if the average warriors of Lacedaemonia took interest (which may be doubted) in any poetry at all, the military songs which they heard and sang must have been songs in their own language, something resembling in style, but with more of local colour and archaism, the most 'Laconian' of the fragments attributed to Alcman, or the fictitious Laconian of Aristophanes. That then, or for many generations later, they cheered their fights and watches with classical elegiacs, we should believe as soon as that 'Come if you dare, our trumpets sound' was a favourite in the camp of Robert Bruce. If Tyrtaeus flourished in 680 B.C., or near that time, then what Strabo and Pausanias knew as his works were all, on the face of them, spurious—a conclusion which there would be no difficulty in accepting. Indeed, Strabo at least was aware that the genuineness of his quotations might be questioned, and makes some remarks on the subject; which however show, as might be expected, an imperfect conception of the arguments which should be brought to bear. Before his time it had become practically impossible that, by the learned of Graeco-Roman society in general, the question should be seen in a true light. We will return to this presently.

If the alleged works be spurious, it makes, so far as concerns the authenticity of what is called the 'history' of the early Messenian wars, little or no difference, whether we do or do not suppose 'the real Tyrtaeus' to have lived in the age to which these wars are assigned. The claim of that 'history', to be better accredited than other legends or traditions respecting times before continuous record, has hitherto rested, not on the name or story of Tyrtaeus, but on the supposed existence, in this one instance, of these wonderfully early documents. If the framers of the story had some genuine documents, then they, or their authorities, might well have had others of equal authenticity. But if Tyrtaeus, however real a person, left nothing properly certified except his name, which served as a peg upon which to hang sundry forgeries, then we cannot hope to win trustworthy information by sifting the poetic fables which gathered around it and them.

But the hypothesis of forgery is one which, at this stage, it would be premature to entertain. *Prima facie*, and until the contrary is proved, the works of Tyrtaeus, presented to us with the invariable statement that they were composed for Lacedaemonians, and conquered the admiration of the Lacedaemonian public, are themselves evidence that Tyrtaeus lived at a time when such works could have had this origin and history. Our business is therefore to examine, and to examine without prejudice, the statements of our authorities on the date of Tyrtaeus the man, and to see whether they really support that early date which would raise a difficulty, and call in the hypothesis of forgery as an explanation. This ground we will not now traverse again, but will turn at once to the cardinal authority, the passage of Lycurgus (*Leocrat.* §§ 102–109). I am still unable as ever to see how that passage can be understood at all on any other supposition than that Tyrtaeus, according to

Lycurgus, lived and composed in the fifth century B.C.

The passage, of which a complete version is given in my previous paper, shall here be recapitulated briefly. It begins with a reference to Homer, to the public adoption of his works by the Athenians, as evidenced by the legal establishment of the recitations at the Panathenaea, and to the improvement in Athenian character which thereupon ensued. To this cause is attributed the excellent spirit displayed by Athens in the delivery of Hellas from the Persians, and in particular at the battle of Marathon. Such, continues the orator, were the Athenians of that age that the Lacedaemonians themselves, being at war with the Messenians, took a leader from Athens in the person of Tyrtaeus, who not only brought them victory, but also aided them in framing an improved education for their youth, based upon the teaching of his own patriotic poetry in elegiacs, from which a long extract is cited. So efficient was this poetry in stimulating the spirit and patriotism of the Lacedaemonians, that they disputed with Athens the 'hegemony' or leadership in Hellas.

That part of the original, which corresponds to my last sentence, runs as follows: *οὕτω τοίνυν εἶχον πρὸς ἀνδρείαν οἱ τούτων* (the poetry of Tyrtaeus) *ἀκούοντες, ὥστε πρὸς τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν περὶ τῆς ἡγημονίας ἀμφισβητεῖν. εἰκότως· τὰ γὰρ κάλλιστα τῶν ἔργων ἀμφοτέροις ἦν κατειργασμένα. οἱ μὲν γὰρ πρόγονοι τοὺς βαρβάρους ἐνίκησαν οἱ πρῶτοι τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἐπέβησαν, καὶ καταφανῆ ἐποίησαν τὴν ἀνδρείαν τοῦ πλούτου καὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν τοῦ πλήθους περιγιγνομένην. Λακεδαιμόνιοι δ' ἐν Θερμοπύλαις παραταξάμενοι ταῖς μὲν τύχαις οὐχ ὁμοίως ἐχρήσαντο, τῇ δ' ἀνδρείᾳ πολὺ πάντων διήνεγκαν.* These are the words to which Mr. Macan, in the paragraph which he gives to '*The Date of Tyrtaeus*,' confines his remarks, and of which he says, very truly, that they do not demand for Tyrtaeus a date after the Persian wars. But neither do they demand a date before them. Taken by themselves, they leave for the date so wide a choice, as to be almost insignificant upon the question. We learn from them only that the time, when Tyrtaeus, as previously narrated, established his works as the material of education in Lacedaemonia, was before the time when Sparta 'contended against Athens for the hegemony'; and not so long before (I think we must add) but that, at the time of the 'contention', the national performances of the Lacedaemonians might be attributed mainly and essentially to his reforms. This upward limit is vague, but not absolutely indefinite. An educational force or an educational system, however permanent, could not naturally be cited as the main and true cause of what was done, by the people subject to it, at a particular epoch, if at that epoch it had been acting for more than a moderate space of time, a generation, let us say, or two at the most. With lapse of time the effect of this single cause must become so entangled with those of other causes, that to trace so precise and particular a connexion would be irrational. The English character, and therefore all the acts of England, are deeply affected to this day, and long will be, by the educational revolution of the sixteenth century, the diffusion of Protestantism and of the English Bible. Yet no one could reasonably say that the Reformation showed its effect in the stand made by England against Napoleon. On the other hand the stand against Philip, and the formation of the Puritan party, of course could and would be properly traced to this particular cause. This would give us for Tyrtaeus some sort of a *terminus a quo*, and one which, vague as it is, would scarcely admit the seventh century, to say nothing of 680 B.C. But what is the *terminus ad quem*? When was it that the Lacedaemonians 'contended against Athens for the hegemony'? I suppose that by a liberal interpretation, without actual violence, the words might apply to almost any time from (say) the middle of the sixth century to near the middle of the fourth, the age of Lycurgus himself. I took them and take them still (for reasons which will presently appear) to refer to the last half of the fifth century, the Peloponnesian war and what led up to it. And surely if any one were asked 'When did Athens and Sparta contend for the hegemony?', 'In the Peloponnesian war' would be the first and most obvious answer. As for the immediate context, the passage already cited in the original, it neither proves this particular reference, nor excludes it:

> And the people therefore, who were in the habit of hearing this poetry, were so disposed to bravery, that they disputed the primacy with Athens, a dispute for which, it must be admitted, there was reason on both sides in high actions formerly achieved. Our ancestors had defeated that first invading army landed by the Persians upon Attica, and thus revealed the superiority of courage above wealth and of valour above numbers. The Lacedaemonians in the lines of Thermopylae, if not so fortunate, in courage surpassed all rivalry...

Mr. Macan would take the words *οἱ μὲν γὰρ πρόγονοι τοὺς βαρβάρους ἐνίκησαν* κ.τ.λ. as referring back to *περὶ τῆς ἡγημονίας ἀμφισβητεῖν*, translating them (I presume,

and it is a perfectly legitimate translation) 'Our ancestors *defeated*' etc. He thus deduces that the 'dispute for the primacy', or, to speak with more technical accuracy, for the 'hegemony' of Hellas, consisted in the rival exploits of Athens at Marathon and Sparta at Thermopylae. Whether the term 'contest for the hegemony' applies to those battles quite as naturally as to the Peloponnesian war may be open to question; I am not sure whether *a priori* one would naturally say that the Spartans at Thermopylae were 'contending against Athens for the hegemony.' Also it does not appear, what precisely, on this reading, were the supreme exploits which, before the 'contest for the hegemony', that is *ex hypothesi* before Marathon and Thermopylae, 'had been achieved' (*ἦν κατειργασμένα*) by the rivals respectively, or why these previous exploits are brought into view. However I am quite ready to admit the interpretation, so far, as possible. But necessary it is not. If, upon other grounds, we see reason to think that by the 'contest for the hegemony' the speaker means the Peloponnesian war, then we shall of course refer the words *οἱ μὲν γὰρ πρόγονοι κ.τ.λ.*, with at least equal justification, not to the more remote *ἀμφισβητεῖν*, but to the clause which immediately precedes them, *τὰ γὰρ κάλλιστα...κατειργασμένα*, translating, as in the version above, 'Our ancestors *had defeated*...,' not 'Our ancestors *defeated*...,' the aorist *ἐνίκησαν* admitting either version equally, and being in fact the only tense which, on either hypothesis, could naturally and idiomatically be employed. Marathon and Thermopylae, on this reading, were not the 'contest for the hegemony', but previous exploits which justified both rivals, the Lacedaemonians no less than the Athenians, in claiming the first place, and in pressing their claims to the arbitration of war. The orator, who throughout speaks of the Lacedaemonians with a friendly feeling, after glancing at the great duel of Athens and Sparta and at the passions of a time passed away, returns, by a dexterous transition, to the more congenial topic of their achievements against the common enemy.

From this then, and if we took this part of Lycurgus' remarks by itself, we could learn, as to his opinion respecting the date of Tyrtaeus, not indeed nothing, but nothing precise. It would appear that at all events he did not agree with the opinion established in later times, and did not put Tyrtaeus anywhere near 680 B.C. The sixth century, and the latter part of it rather, would be the earliest epoch naturally admissible; but anywhere from 550 to 450 would be a date which, so far, we might accept.

But I did not see before, and do not see now, why we should be at the pains to consider what would be the effect of this particular portion taken separately, when the point, which (as we will assume) it would leave in doubt, has been already determined by what precedes. Lycurgus, after reminding his hearers that their fathers had established Homer as the legalized poet of Athens, and referring in this connexion particularly to the recitations at the quadrennial Panathenaea, deduces, from the educational effect of Homer upon such habitual hearers, the public spirit and Hellenic patriotism displayed by Athens in the repulse of Persia, and specially the battle of Marathon. He then continues thus:

τοιγαροῦν οὕτως ἦσαν ἄνδρες σπουδαῖοι καὶ κοινῇ καὶ ἰδίᾳ οἱ τότε τὴν πόλιν οἰκοῦντες, ὥστε τοῖς ἀνδρειοτάτοις Λακεδαιμόνιοις ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις πολεμοῦσι πρὸς Μεσσηνίους ἀνεῖλεν ὁ θεὸς παρ' ἡμῶν ἡγέμονα λαβεῖν καὶ νικήσειν τοὺς ἐναντίους.....[1] *τὶς γὰρ οὐκ οἶδε τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὅτι Τυρταῖον στρατηγὸν ἔλαβον παρὰ τῆς πόλεως, μεθ' οὗ καὶ τῶν πολεμίων ἐκράτησαν καὶ τὴν περὶ τοὺς νέους ἐπιμέλειαν συνετάξαντο, οὐ μόνον εἰς τὸν παρόντα κίνδυνον ἀλλ' εἰς ἅπαντα τὸν αἰῶνα βουλευσάμενοι καλῶς; κατέλιπε γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐλεγεῖα ποιήσας, ὧν ἀκούοντες παιδεύονται πρὸς ἀνδρείαν, καὶ περὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ποιήτας οὐδένα λόγον ἔχοντες περὶ τούτου οὕτω σφόδρα ἐσπουδάκασι ὥστε νόμον ἔθεντο κ.τ.λ.*

and so we go on to a long citation from Tyrtaeus himself, and finally to the effect of this influence and training upon the Lacedaemonians, as set forth in the passage previously cited.

And therefore so excellent, both as a body and as individuals, were the men by whom our city was *in those days* administered, that when the Lacedaemonians, who in earlier times were first in martial qualities, had a war with the Messenians, they were commanded by the oracle to take a leader from among us, and were promised victory, if they did so, over

[1] The words omitted merely dwell on the splendour of the compliment thus paid to Athens, and have no bearing on the question of date. It is unnecessary to repeat here what was said in the previous paper upon the ambiguity of *ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις*. Mr. Macan, I am glad to see, agrees with me that these words determine nothing, and that, of the many admissible ways of construing and interpreting them, more than one is consistent with my general view.

their opponents. . . . It is matter of common knowledge that the director, whom they received from Athens, was Tyrtaeus, by whose help they overcame their enemies, and also framed a system of discipline for their youth. . . .

This is the passage of which I said, and must still say, that the only date which it allows for Tyrtaeus (in the opinion of Lycurgus, of course) is the Messenian war of 464–454 B.C. The Athenians, from among whom Tyrtaeus emigrated, were the Athenians *of those days*, οἱ τότε τὴν πόλιν οἰκοῦντες. The speaker has just dwelt at length upon the great achievements of the Athenians in the Persian wars. Unless the adoption of Tyrtaeus by the Lacedaemonians took place at the same time or some closely approximate time, what can it have to do with the subject, or how could it prove the excellence attained by the Athenians *in those days*? And if we take the speaker to be proceeding in a proper order, if we do not arbitrarily assume that he here suddenly reverses the natural course of thought, we must suppose that he places Tyrtaeus near *and after* the Persian wars, not near and before them. I will even make bold to say that, if we had only Lycurgus to deal with, no other idea would ever have been suggested. Nor will it make any difference if, forcing his arrangement, we extend *those days* backward so as to cover the time near, but prior to, the Persian wars. For in any case, and on pain of destroying his whole argument, they must be *posterior to the legal establishment of Homer as the state-poetry and educational literature of Athens*. To trace the sequel and effect of that educational advance, the most momentous thing, taken with its consequences, in all Greek history and perhaps in the history of the world, is the speaker's whole design. That the change took place, not in a day of course, but gradually, during the central part of the sixth century, all, I believe, are agreed; our authorities assign it sometimes to Pisistratus, sometimes to his sons, sometimes (but this under suspicion of prejudice) to Solon. But we should know of it, and could date it, without any express authority. We should know it by its effects. The tragedy of Aeschylus, and all the public literature which followed it, the ecclesia of Cleisthenes, and all that made its fate so different from that of other democratic experiments, the larger thoughts and wider sympathies which within a score of years converted (as Lycurgus indicates) a mere canton into the conscious centre of a nation, and made in fact a new Hellas—the whole story of Athens is but one commentary on the fact that towards the close of the sixth century there arose in Athens a generation of men far exceeding all predecessors and contemporaries in respect of diffused intelligence. Lycurgus, when he deduces the repulse of the barbarian from 'the recitations at the Panathenaea', is referring in the accustomed form to this unparalleled development and its educational causes. That he should bring into his story, as part of the effect, something which happened before the new education could have produced any fruits, or before it was even begun, I took and take to be impossible. On no narrow or technical construction therefore, but on the plain purport of the whole passage, I assume 530 (or, if any one pleases, 540) to be the very earliest date to which any part of the story (Tyrtaeus included) can be carried back. But if so, we need not ask whether the speaker does or does not give us other reason for placing Tyrtaeus after the Persian wars; it is enough for the purpose that he places him after Pisistratus. For starting thence we must still come down to 464 to find any time to which the story could be fitted, to find a 'Messenian war'. At least so I supposed. If this is not so, if some hitherto unknown 'Messenian war' can be fixed (say) about 520, I shall be ready to admit that Lycurgus might have linked Tyrtaeus with that war and date; though I should still think that, in that case, his arrangement of his matter would be perverse, and should still therefore prefer the date 464, as not raising needless objections. As things are, 464 seems not only obvious, but inevitable; it also satisfies all the other conditions of the context, following near after the Persian wars (as it should) and preceding (as it should) by about one generation that unique and special 'contest for the hegemony between Athens and Sparta' which is commonly called the Peloponnesian war.

Thus much as to the opinion of Lycurgus. Whether he was right is another matter; I see no reason to doubt it, but will refer to my previous paper. As however I do not wish to return to the subject again, I should like to add one consideration which was before not very clearly brought out. The mere fact, that Lycurgus attributes to Tyrtaeus the composition of commonplace, flowing, and classical elegiacs, would be of itself a grave reason for thinking that he cannot have dated Tyrtaeus as he was dated by Strabo, Pausanias, and others of those later times. I mean that the wild error as to the date of the style, though possible

in the days of Augustus or Caracalla, and quite of a piece with much that was then calmly narrated and believed, cannot with equal propriety be attributed to an Athenian statesman of the fourth century B.C. Whether Strabo or Lycurgus would have judged better in a case where knowledge was equal, we need not inquire; in this case knowledge, vital and efficient knowledge, could not be equal, and the advantage was greatly with Lycurgus. What makes the account of Strabo impossible (given for Tyrtaeus the date which he asserts) is the deep and wide difference in language, linguistic affinity, taste, habit, and tradition, which existed between Athens and Sparta until long after the era assigned, and which at that era, so far as we can conjecture, had not even begun to be bridged. Now to educated men in the age of Augustus, or even in the age of the Diadochi, distinctions of this kind, between Greek and Greek, had almost no practical importance, and were known only as matters of history, erudition, or literary fancy. The process of amalgamation, the process of which the introduction of Tyrtaeus and his works to Sparta was one, not unimportant, stage, had been accomplished, and all dialectical or local peculiarities merged, so far as concerned the ordinary life of educated men, in one common language, which flattered itself that it was Athenian. Compared with the actual state of the world, the fifth century was almost as remote and unreal as the seventh; and there was nothing to prevent a confusion between the two but the weak barrier of acquired science. Altogether different was the position of an Athenian statesman in the fourth century, of such a man as Lycurgus. To him the moral and mental difference between Attica and Lacedaemonia was not a matter of historical or literary learning; it was a fact of vital importance in common life and current politics. The process of assimilation between the peoples, and the creation of a common medium, had by no means yet been brought so far as to put out of sight the time when it had been begun and the stages by which it had been carried on. In the very passage before us Lycurgus, as we have seen, shows himself perfectly aware that even then, in his own day, Lacedaemonia, as a whole, was a field practically closed against that literature which was being studied, admired, and enlarged by Athens. Of all that made the story of Tyrtaeus and his elegiacs, as Lycurgus tells it, possible for the middle of the fifth century, but impossible for the beginning of the seventh, Lycurgus could not, as it would seem, be ignorant. For this reason, as well as others, I take him to mean the simple, natural, and reasonable thing, which he appears to say. And since his account is contradicted by no one, who, on such a point, is entitled comparatively or positively to consideration, I accept it, as at present advised, without hesitation as true.

A. W. Verrall.

THE GENITIVES Τλᾱσίᾱϝο AND Πασιάδᾱϝο.

A companion piece to the much-discussed Τλᾱσίᾱϝο of the Menecrates monument at Corfu (Roberts, *Introd. to Grk. Epigraphy*, no. 98, Cauer, *Delectus*,[2] no. 83) has recently turned up in an inscription from Gela published in the *Notizie degli Scavi* of April-June '96. Written *βουστροφηδόν* in archaic characters as shown by the facsimile, the editor, Salinas, is fully justified in claiming it as the oldest Greek inscription of Sicily. It reads with the proper transcription: Πασιάδᾱϝο τὸ σᾶμα· Κράτης ἐποίει, In a note which the editor adds to his own comments, Comparetti remarks on the genitive form with ϝ as paralleled only by the Corcyran Τλᾱσίᾱϝο and that in a metrical inscription, adding further that the uncontracted form in -ᾱο on a prose inscription of Sicily is itself a sign of considerable antiquity.

This new form after the not uncommon habit of new facts seems at first only to add to our embarrassment. For, unless I am mistaken, it completely upsets the explanation of Τλᾱσίᾱϝο which up to this time has seemed the most acceptable. I refer to the view of Blass, *Sat. phil. Sauppio obl.* p. 131, approved by G. Meyer, Grk. Gr.[2] p. 335, Brugmann, Grk. Gr.[2] p. 120 and others. Blass supposes that the writer of the Menecrates epitaph, in using the epic -ᾱο in place of the contracted genitive in -ᾱ familiar to his own speech, was led by νᾱϝός, λᾱϝός, etc. to the spelling -ᾱϝο. For a single occurr-

ence and that too in a metrical inscription this was plausible enough, but when we meet with a second occurrence and this time in a prose inscription, we are forced to the conviction that there is something more behind it. And yet our knowledge of the history of the genitive formation is sufficient to make it impossible to attribute any etymological value to the *F*, Fick, BzB. 11,248, notwithstanding. There is only one form of explanation left, namely that the *F* is due to a secondary development. One recalls the Delian *ἀFυτοῦ* and in looking up the other instances of such sporadic spelling one notes that besides the Cretan *ἀμεFυσάσθαι* and *ἀ]Fυτάν* (Comparetti, *Monumenti Antichi*, iii., nos. 12–13, 18), Attic *ἀFυτάρ*, *ναFυ[πηγός* (*C.I.A.* iv. pt. 1, pp. 189, 198), an *ἀFυτάν* is found on another Corcyran tombstone (Roberts, no. 99) of the same age as that containing *ΤλᾱσίᾱFο*. In these cases the *F* is only the expression of that slight glide sound which is naturally produced in passing from another vowel sound to that of *u*. Anyone may make the experiment and observe it clearly in the case of *ā-u* when pronounced slowly. But one is hardly conscious of such a glide and hence it is only rarely that it is indicated in the writing. Now the same glide is possible before a close *o*. The Greek *o*, as we know, was relatively close in those dialects in which the lengthened *o* was indicated by *ου* not *ω*, and to these belong the Rhodian and Corinthian. It is possible, though this is not a necessary assumption, that at Corcyra and Gela the final *o* was especially close, so that the pronunciation of the ending was not so very different from that of the Arcadian and Cyprian, which was always written *-αν*. *An Arcadian genitive in -αFν would give us no trouble, in view of spellings like ἀFυτάν, and my contention is that the F of ΤλᾱσίᾱFο and ΠασιάδᾱFο is to be regarded in the same light.*

Aside from the genitive form, the interest of the inscription is solely palaeographical, it being the second important addition to the material for the study of the alphabet of Rhodes and its colonies which has appeared since the discussions of Kirchhoff and Roberts. It shows neither the Argive type (Kirchhoff p. 48, Roberts, no. 131) which has san, not sigma, nor that represented by vases of Cameirus and now by the earliest stone inscriptions of Rhodes (*Mitth.* 16, 107 f.) which besides the $\Psi = \chi$ has $H = \eta$. But, though most of the characteristic letters are wanting, nothing stands in the way of identifying its alphabet with that of the bronze plate found at Olympia and bearing the name of Gela (Roberts, p. 322). The two agree against the others in the combination of the three-barred sigma with $E = \eta$.

Carl D. Buck.

University of Chicago,
January '97.

THE EARLIEST APPEARANCE IN PRINT OF THE FIRST IDYLL OF MOSCHUS.

The rare volume printed by Goltz at Bruges in 1565 under the editorship of Adolph Mekerch holds the rank of the *Editio Princeps* of Moschus and Bion. But, as is well-known, the three principal and longest Idylls of Moschus together with several of those of Bion are to be found mixed up with those of Theocritus in the volume printed by Aldus in 1495–6 which purports to contain the Eclogues of Theocritus, the verses of the Gnomic Poets, those of Hesiod and some others. This book has hitherto been supposed to be the earliest printed volume which contains any of the Idylls or fragments of Moschus, and it has escaped the notice as well of the editors of this poet as of all bibliographers that his first Idyll *Ἔρως δραπέτης* had been printed six years earlier, and is in fact one of the earliest printed pieces of classical Greek, since at the date of its appearance thirteen Greek books only had issued from the press, and of these there are only three that can be considered as classics — Homer, Aesop, and the Batrachomyomachia—the other ten being Psalters, Grammars and Dictionaries.

Although a few words were printed with Greek letters as early as 1465 in the *Paradoxa* of Cicero given by Fust and Schoeffer in that year, and though in the works that issued from the press of Sweynheym and Pannartz from 1465 to 1470, and notably in the Aulus Gellius of 1469, as well as in one or two books of others printers, there are long passages in Greek characters, the

earliest volume printed in Greek was the first book of the *Grammar of Lascaris* which appeared at Milan in 1476 or 1477 (the colophon being dated MCCCCLXXVI die XXX Januarii). A second edition with a Latin translation by Craston was printed, also at Milan, in 1480, and a third with the same translation by Leonardus de Basilea at Vicenza in 1489. In this third edition the Grammar ends on the recto of the ninety-seventh leaf, and is followed on the same page by the colophon. Then on the two next pages come twenty-nine Greek verses, being in fact the first Idyll of Moschus without either the name of the author or the usual title Ἔρως δραπέτης but with the rather mysterious heading *στίχη ἡειωικοὶ εἰς τὸν ἔρωτα*. The only writer so far as I know who has mentioned these verses is Dibdin who in the third volume of the *Bibliotheca Spenceriana*, p. 82, thus refers to them :—

'On the reverse of this leaf we read nearly one half of twenty-nine verses (printed widely apart in a large full Greek type, not very dissimilar to that of the first Isocrates) which are thus whimsically entitled :—

στίχη ἡειωικοὶ εἰς τὸν ἔρωτα

The remaining number of these verses is on the recto of the following and last leaf which completes the tenth leaf of signature m.' But Dibdin did not recognise these verses as those of Moschus, and indeed probably did not read them. The volume, like most early Greek impressions is carelessly printed and full of mistakes, and the 'whimsical title' is probably a misprint for

στίχοι ἡρωικοὶ εἰς τὸν ἔρωτα.

The Idyll was certainly printed from a different manuscript from that from which the copy in the Aldine Theocritus was taken, and presents numerous variations from that text, most of them perhaps errors of the copyist or of the printer but some few deserving the attention of the editors and students of Moschus. The *variae lectiones* are as follows :—

	The Lascaris		*The Aldine Theocritus*
Line 1	ἔβοειστει	for	ἐβώστρει.
3	μηνυτὰς	,,	μανυτὰς.
4	δ before ἀγάγης is omitted.		
6	ἔστι δὲ παῖς	for	ἔστι δ' ὁ παῖς.
10	δὲ χολᾶ	,,	δὲ χολᾷ.
	ἠπεροπευτὰς	,,	ἠπεροπευτάς
13	τίνω	,,	τήνῳ.
16	ἐφίπαται	,,	ἐφίπταται.
17	οπλάγχνοις	,,	σπλάγχνοις.
18	τόξω	,,	τόξῳ.
19	βέλεμνον	,,	βόλεμνον.
21	κἤμε πτρόσκει	,,	κἀμὲ τιτρώσκει.
22	ἀυτῶ	,,	αυτῳ.
23	ἀνάισθει	,,	ἀαίθει.
24	δαμάσας	,,	δάσας.
25	χλέοντα	,,	κλαίοντα.
	φυλάξεω	,,	φυλάσσεο.
26	γελάη	,,	γελάᾳ.
	φιλῆσαὶ	,,	φιλᾶσαι.
28	ἦν λέγη	,,	ἤν δὲ λέγη.
	ὅσαμὸι	,,	ὅσσά μοι.

RICHARD C. CHRISTIE.

JEBB'S SOPHOCLES.

DEALING with a text so difficult as that of Sophocles, one may without disrespect occasionally differ from the interpretation of the most distinguished teacher. The appearance of the seventh and last play of the Sophoclean drama, which Professor Jebb has been giving to the world with a revised text and an English version, seems to be a fitting opportunity of offering for consideration the grounds on which in a few passages I would venture to differ from the judgment of so trustworthy a guide.

In the following remarks the texts under examination are followed by Professor Jebb's version between inverted commas.

Oedipus Tyrannus.

1. ὡς τοῖσιν ἐμπείροισι καὶ τὰς ξυμφορὰς
ζώσας ὁρῶ μάλιστα τῶν βουλευμάτων.
44–45.

'For I see that when men have been proved in deeds past, the issues of their counsels, too, most often have effect.'

A note remarks that *ἐμπείροισι* and *βουλευμάτων* imply the antithesis between past and future.

But the position of the words shows that the antithesis lies between *ἐμπείροισι* and *ξυμφοράς*, and prohibits our placing any

accentuation on the distant *βουλευμάτων*. The question then is, what is the exact meaning of *ξυμφοράς*, and the answer is supplied by a line of Aeschylus:—

πιστοῖσι πιστὰ ξυμφέρειν βουλεύματα, *Persae* 528.

which shows that it means consultation, or *conference* of counsel.

The lamented Professor Munro once said to me in conversation that he doubted whether so common a word as *ξυμφορὰ* could have borne so archaic—so etymological a meaning as conference in the days of Sophocles.

But the Persae of Aeschylus, slightly as we may esteem it, was so flattering to the pride of Athens that probably it was pretty well known by heart in the time of his rival, and would at once have suggested the meaning of *ξυμφοραὶ βουλευμάτων*.

The passage, then means: the wise (those who are good at initiative) are also best in conference of counsel (in appreciating the suggestions of another). The context, I may add, clamours for this meaning.

The love of Sophocles for *γνῶμαι* is known to all his readers, and there is an obvious allusion here to the maxim of Hesiod:

οὗτος μὲν πανάριστος ὃς αὐτὸς πάντα νοήσῃ
φρασσάμενος τά κ' ἔπειτα καὶ ἐς τέλος ἧσιν ἀμείνω.
ἐσθλὸς δ' αὖ κἀκεῖνος ὃς εὖ εἰπόντι πίθηται.

Aristotle, as students of his Ethics know, traces the same antithesis between the *φρόνιμος* and the *συνετός*.

Professor Jebb says that *ζώσας* does not mean successful but effectual. But surely in this context these words would be synonymous.

Professor Campbell lays stress on *ξυμφοράς*, but gives it a meaning which seems to make the sentence inane. He explains: 'not only are the counsels good, but their issues are also good.' But how can counsels be good if their issues are not good?

Professor Kennedy advocated the interpretation here adopted, but I think that his pamphlet, which is not before me, contained some unconvincing view about the force of *ζώσας*.

Sophocles does not exactly reproduce Hesiod's maxim, which only asserts the superiority of Initiative to Appreciation; whereas the speaker in the text affirms that the inferior faculty accompanies the superior. And perhaps there is a further difference. If *ἐμπειρία* only means Experience without any suggestion of Invention or Origination, the proposition of the high-priest of Zeus becomes: Experience (dealing with things) is the best preparation for Conference (dealing with persons); an antithesis which still requires Conference for its second term.

2. *τοῦτον κελεύω πάντα σημαίνειν ἐμοί·*
κεἰ μὲν φοβεῖται, τοὐπίκλημ' ὑπεξελεῖν
αὐτὸν καθ' αὑτοῦ. 226.

'And if he is afraid, I bid him to remove the danger of the charge from his own path.'

I only quote this admirable correction of the text for the sake of adding from the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* another illustration of the meaning of *ὑπεξελεῖν*: *ἀπέκτεινον . . . ὑπεξαιρούμενοι τὸν φόβον*. 35. 'Removing the objects of their fear—those in whom they saw a future danger:' where *ὑπό* does not mean, as Sandys translates, 'cunningly' but 'beforehand'—'by way of precaution,' or 'anticipation.'

3. *στυγνὸς μὲν εἴκων δῆλος εἶ, βαρὺς δ' ὅταν*
θυμοῦ περάσῃς. 673.

'Sullen in yielding art thou seen, even as vehement in the excess of thy wrath.' A note adds: 'fierce when thou hast gone far in wrath.'

But surely it is a truism to say that a man is fierce when he is far gone in wrath. The position of the speakers and the tense of *περάσῃς* seem to point to the meaning: 'bitter when thou hast passed from passion,' *i.e.* when thou hast controlled thy fury and professed to acquit or pardon. *στυγνὸς* and *βαρὺς* seem about synonymous, and, as *ὅταν θυμοῦ περάσῃς* is equivalent to *ὅταν εἰξῇς*, the chief, or only, antithesis is between the tenses of *εἴκων* and *περάσῃς*.

4. *δόκησις ἀγὼς λόγων ἦλθε.* 681.

'Blind suspicion bred of talk arose.'

There is not much to object to here, but a note speaks of suspicions resting on assertions of Oedipus. Surely the *λόγοι* were the words of Teiresias; and the meaning is: Rashly-formed suspicions were bred of words (uttered by Teiresias); or, if *δόκησις* means interpretation rather than suspicion: Interpretation—unwarranted—of words (that fell from Teiresias, as incriminating Creon) was avowed.

If *δόκησις* means suspicion, *λόγων* will depend on *ἦλθε*; if interpretation, on *δόκησις*.

5. *ὅλοιθ' ὅστις ἦν ὃς ἀγρίας πέδας*
νομάδος ἐπιποδίας ἔλαβέ μ' ἀπό τε φόνου
ἔρρυτο. 1349.

To restore the metre (a double dochmiac) Professor Jebb would change *νομάδος* into *μονάδ'*. The line then in its resolved syllables exactly corresponds with the preceding:

ὁ κακὰ κακὰ τελῶν ἐμὰ τάδ' ἐμὰ πάθεα.

Is it worth while suggesting, what seems to me more euphonious, a change of *ἐπιποδίας* into *ἐπιποδίου*? Intervening between *πέδας* and *ἐπιποδίου, νομάδος* might surely mean: biting, wounding, lacerating; which Professor Jebb apparently doubts.

Oedipus Coloneus.

1. *τοιαῦτά σοι ταῦτ' ἐστὶν, ὦ ξέν', οὐ λόγοις*
τιμώμεν' ἀλλὰ τῇ ξυνουσίᾳ πλέον. 62.

'Such thou mayest know, Stranger, are these haunts, not honoured in story but rather in the life that loves them.'

The meaning of the version is not clear. Does not the text mean: 'Such, Stranger, is this spot, whose charms men attest not so much by words as by making it their abode'? Colonus was, and still is, a beautiful suburb of Athens, and probably in the days of Sophocles was the site of many villas.

2. *ὦ πάντα τολμῶν κἀπὸ παντὸς ἂν φέρων*
λόγου δικαίου μηχάνημα ποικίλον. 761.

'All-daring, who from any plea of right wouldest draw a crafty device,' A note adds that this is better than to make *παντὸς* neuter, taking *λόγου δικαίου* as defining genitive with *μηχάνημα*; which would mean: 'thou who from anything wouldest borrow a crafty device, consisting in a fair plea.' If this were the translation required, it is not surprising that the construction should be rejected. Believing the construction to be correct, I would render: 'Oh thou who from any case couldest extract a righteous defence by cunning sophistry': or, 'Oh thou who for any cause couldest construct a sanctimonious plea by cunning rhetoric:' which would not be quite so imbecile. Compare the lines which presently occur:

γλώσσῃ σὺ δεινός· ἄνδρα δ' οὐδέν' οἶδ' ἐγὼ
δίκαιον ὅστις ἐξ ἅπαντος εὖ λέγει. 806.

where the phrase, *φέρων λόγου δικαίου μηχάνημα ποικίλον*, is concentrated in a monosyllable.

3. *οὐκ ἔστι σοι ταῦτ', ἀλλὰ σοι τάδ' ἐστ,' ἐκεῖ*
χώρας ἀλάστωρ ὁυμός ἐνναίων ἀεί. 787.

'That portion is not for thee, but this—my curse upon the country, ever abiding therein.'

A note rejects what seems the true construction, saying: if we joined *ἐκεῖ χώρας* the phrase could mean nothing but: in that part of the country, which is pointless here. The phrase would rather mean: in that part of the world, pointed, if point there must be, with something of contempt and hate in the vagueness of the expression.

The objection to joining *χώρας* with *ἀλάστωρ* is that it misplaces the emphasis, throwing it on *χώρας* rather than on *ἀλάστωρ*, and thus making the language unworthy of Oedipus and of Sophocles. Ἀλάστωρ must follow the adverb of place (*ἐκεῖ χώρας*) immediately and without the interposition of any enfeebling word, or the sentence is spoilt. The effect is like what would be produced on Professor Jebb's version if we were to read: upon the country my curse, instead of: my curse upon the country.

4. *πρᾶγος δ' ἀτίζειν οὐδὲν ἄνθρωπον χρεών.* 1153.

'And mortal man should deem nothing beneath his care.'

A note expands this into: 'a mortal man can never be sure that an incident, seemingly trivial, will not prove momentous': a statement, be it observed, neither true nor heroic, and that should have omitted *πρᾶγος*.

The line, seemingly easy, is very difficult, because it requires us to specialise the meaning of a word that in general means nothing very special. The most beggarly elements of language, however, forbid us to treat so slightingly, as this version does, the leading word of the proposition: but then what special meaning are we to assign to *πρᾶγος*? In the absence of data we are reduced to guessing. Does it mean Fortune in a generic sense, embracing prosperity and adversity, (*εὐπραγία* and *δυσπραγία*) so that we might paraphrase: No fortune is so lowly (no plight is so abject) that man, that creature of accident, should turn a deaf ear to a suppliant? The utterance of such a sentiment, besides its immediate application, might be intended to mark the idiosyncracy of Theseus, and thus to attenuate what,

considering ancient superstitions, is the great improbability of the play; the improbability that the cry of the chorus: ἔξω πόρσω βαίνετε χώρας, should not have been enforced, and that Oedipus should have been permitted to remain on the soil of Athens.

τοιοῦτον αὐτοῖς Ἄρεος εὔβουλον πάγον
ἐγὼ ξυνῄδη χθόνιον ὄνθ', ὃς οὐκ ἐᾷ
τοιούσδ' ἀλήτας τῇδ' ὁμοῦ ναίειν πόλει.

5. ὁ δ' ἐπίκουρος ἰσοτέλεστος
Ἄϊδος ὅτε μοῖρ' ἀνυμέναιος
ἄλυρος ἄχορος ἀναπέφηνε,
θάνατος ἐς τελευτάν. 1220.

'And the Deliverer makes an end for all alike,—when the doom of Hades is suddenly revealed, without marriage-song, or lyre, or dance,—even Death at the last.' Here a mistranslation, interposing a patch of words of little meaning, seems to wreck what is perhaps the most powerful lyric of Sophocles that has come down to us.

The true construction requires a comma after ἐπίκουρος, to show that ἰσοτέλεστος Ἄϊδος μοῖρα is an epithet of Γῆρας: ἀνυμέναιος, ἄλυρος, ἄχορος being an epexegesis of ἰσοτέλεστος Ἄϊδος. If we abide by Liddell and Scott ἰσοτέλεστος simply means an image or similitude. But it seems to contain the word τέλη in the sense of rites paid to a divine power, symbolizing the joys or blessings for which he is worshipped. We may then translate: 'and the Deliverer, when the Fate that shares the joyless rites of Hades has once appeared, rites without marriage-song, or lyre, or dance, is Death who brings the end.'

If Hades is as joyless as Age, and Thanatos introduces to Hades, how, it may be objected, can Thanatos be a deliverer from the evils of Age? The answer to this question is the key to the lyric. Hades is both joyless and painless: Age resembles Hades in the absence of joy but differs in the presence of pain. This point was the subject of the opening strophe:

ἐπεὶ πολλὰ μὲν ἀι μακραὶ
ἁμέραι κατέθεντο δὴ
λύπας ἐγγυτέρω, τὰ τέρ-
ποντα δ' οὐκ ἂν ἴδοις ὅπου.

Thus Hades is a deliverance. If the true interpretation of ἰσοτέλεστος has been given, the word must be confined to the more auspicious aspects of the powers ruling human destinies; for, although equal in respect of joys, that is, of their negation; in respect of sorrows or evils, it seems, Age and Hades have contrasted attributions.

For the construction of ἰσοτέλεστος Ἄϊδος compare: μάτρωος ἰσώνυμον ἔμμεν, Pindar; and: ἀδάμαντος ἰσοσθενὲς ἆορ, Oppian.

6. ὁρᾷ ὁρᾷ ταῦτ' ἀεὶ χρόνος, ἐπεὶ μὲν ἕτερα
τὰ δὲ παρ' ἦμαρ αὖθις αὔξων ἄνω. 1452.

I am surprised that neither Professor Jebb nor any other editor has suggested, to satisfy the requirement of the metre (an iambus followed by two dochmiacs), what seems the obvious correction of ὅτε for ἐπεί. Of course παρ' ἦμαρ δὲ ἄυθις would then stand for ὅτε δέ and τὰ for ἕτερα. The reading would involve the omission of an easily spared γὰρ in the corresponding lines:

τί μὰν ἀφήσει τέλος; δέδια δ', οὐ γὰρ ἄλιον
ἀφορμᾷ ποτ' οὐδ' ἄνευ ξυμφορᾶς.

Antigone.

1. οὐκ ἔστιν· ἀλλὰ ταῦτα καὶ πάλαι πόλεως
ἄνδρες μόλις φέροντες ἐρρόθουν ἐμοί. 289.

'It cannot be. No! from the first there were certain in the town that muttered against me chafing at the edict.'

πόλεως ἄνδρες is here treated as equivalent to τινές: for what does 'in the town' add to the sense? But πόλεως ἄνδρες is the foremost idea in Creon's conception of the agency at work behind the disobedience to his decree. In monarchic or oligarchic Greece ἡ πόλις, that is, ἡ ἀκρόπολις, was occupied by the ruling caste, who alone possessed the full rights of citizenship (πολιτεία); and πόλεως ἄνδρες will accordingly mean: some persons of the highest rank—certain of the class of nobles. Creon suspects some relatives and partisans of Polynices, some members, if there was such a clan, of the clan Labdacidae.

Ἄιδᾳ μόνον
2. φεῦξιν οὐκ ἐπάξεται. 361.

'only against Death shall he call for aid in vain.'

The translation seems to require the reading μόνου. Would not μόνον οὐ mean: he *almost* will find a means of escaping death? Or does μόνον οὐ lose this force when its factors are separated by another word? One would have been glad of evidence on this point.

3. *νόμους γεραίρων χθονὸς θεῶν τ' ἔνορκον δίκαν*
ὑψίπολις, ἄπολις ὅτῳ τὸ μὴ καλὸν
ξύνεστι, τόλμας χάριν. 368.

τόλμας χάριν seems to be connected with *ὑψίπολις* and *ἄπολις* rather than with *ξύνεστιν*; and *ὑψίπολις* seems more germane to the matter if taken to mean: high in the state—honoured by his country, rather than, as Professor Jebb proposes: dweller in a prosperous city.

4. *ταῦτ' οὖν τέκνον φρόνησον· ἀνθρώποισι γὰρ*
τοῖς πᾶσι κοινὸν ἐστι τοὐξαμαρτάνειν·
ἐπεὶ δ' ἁμάρτῃ κεῖνος οὐκ ἔτ' ἔστ' ἀνὴρ
ἄβουλος οὐδ' ἄνολβος ὅστις ἐς κακὸν
πεσὼν ἀκεῖται μηδ' ἀκίνητος πέλει.
αὐθαδία τοι σκαιότητ' ὀφλισκάνει. 1023.

'Self-will, we know, incurs the charge of folly.'

But this is one of the cases where arrangement supplies a word even more pointedly than if it were expressed, sometimes changing, as here, an ostensible proposition into what logicians call its simple converse. In this passage not only the order of words but the lines which precede require us to translate: 'nothing but self-will'—'only obstinacy incurs the charge of folly.' In a similar passage of the O. Col.

θανόντων δ' οὐδὲν ἄλγος ἅπτεται,

'None but the dead are insensible to pain,' Professor Jebb supplies the word 'only.'

5. *τῷ δ' ἀθλίας ἄσημα περιβαίνει βοῆς*
ἕρποντι μᾶλλον ἆσσον. 1209.

'And as the king drew nearer, doubtful sounds of a bitter cry floated around him.'

This translation would be admissible if the line were the composition of a modern undergraduate who would place his epithet *ἀθλίας* wherever it suited his metre, and perhaps would escape a scolding from his tutor: but to Sophocles no such licence was possible. The position of *ἀθλίας* makes it the vital point of the sentence, and, to keep it so, we *under the circumstances* must transfer the anguish from the raiser of the cry to the hearer, and render: 'an indistinct cry of dire significance (or, that froze his blood) floated round the king as he drew nearer.' The words of course intimate that Creon recognized the voice of his son.

Under *other* circumstances *e.g.* if the king expected to hear a sound, but was uncertain whether it would be joyous or mournful, our undergraduate might by the very same words without incurring blame intend to signify that Creon heard 'a bitter cry.' This ambiguity of even well-ordered speech has its analogy in our sense-perceptions, where the same immediate sensations, according to the known circumstances which surround them, receive different interpretations and give different perceptions; *e.g.* may show us a gigantic bird at a distance or a fly crawling on a neighbouring window.

Electra.

1. *ὥσπερ γὰρ ἵππος εὐγενής, κἂν ᾖ γέρων,*
ἐν τοῖσι δεινοῖς θυμὸν οὐκ ἀπώλεσε. 24.

'As a steed of generous race, though old, loses not courage in danger but pricks up his ear.'

But *θυμὸν ἀπολλύναι* is not Greek for losing courage, in the sense of experiencing a transient emotion of fear. The old charger *has* permanently lost his youthful spirits and fire (*θυμὸν*) except at the approach of danger: then they revive. The true version then is: 'as a steed of generous race, though old, *recovers* youthful fire in the moment of danger.' Professor Jebb quotes a writer who, feeling instinctively the accentuation that *ἐν τοῖσι δεινοῖς* receives from its position, perhaps unconsciously, when referring to these lines, substitutes in thought for *οὐκ ἀπώλεσε* the word *ἀνακτᾶται*. *καὶ εἶδον ἄνδρα παραπλήσιον τῷ Σοφοκλείῳ ἵππῳ· νωθρὸς γὰρ ὑφ' ἡλικίας δοκῶν, νεάζουσαν ὁρμὴν ἐν ταῖς σπουδαῖς ἀνεκτᾶτο.* Philostratus.

2. *δράσω· τὸ γὰρ δίκαιον οὐκ ἔχει λόγον*
δυοῖν ἐρίζειν, ἀλλ' ἐπισπεύδειν τὸ δρᾶν. 466.

'I will. When a duty is clear, reason forbids that two voices should contend, and claims the hastening of the deed.'

When a duty, or anything else, is clear, only a fool persists in negation: but when a duty, as in the present case, is not clear, what is to be done? Well! we may abide by a popular proverb. Translate then: 'In a question of duty it is not meet that one should dispute with two, but that he should hasten performance.' Chrysothemis is one, Electra and the Coryphaeus two. *Ἕνα* or *μίαν* is understood, *δίκαιον* is governed by *ἐρίζειν*, *ἔχει λόγον* is impersonal, or has for subject the sentence *τὸ δίκαιον δυοῖν ἐρίζειν*. *τὸ δίκαιον δυοῖν ἐρίζειν* has been well compared with *ἐρίζειν κάλλος Ἀθήνῃ*.

The proverbial maxims that a perso age

accepts are an effective touch, a Greek critic observes, in the portraiture of character. *ἠθικοὺς γὰρ ποιεῖ τοὺς λόγους τὸ γνωμολογεῖν.* Arist. *Rhetoric* 2, 21.

The acceptance of the decision of the majority in a case of conscience is characteristic of the weaker-minded Chrysothemis. She was not born, like her sister Electra, to play the part of Athanasius contra mundum.

3. *ἥξει καὶ πολύπους καὶ πολύχειρ*
ἃ δεινοῖς κρυπτομένα λόχοις
χαλκόπους Ἐρινύς· 489.

'The Erinys of untiring feet, who is lurking in her dread ambush, will come as with the march and with the might of a great host.'

This gives substantially the meaning of the Greek. But in lyrical poetry so much depends on the exact sequence of words and ideas, that a translation is hardly faithful where these are much dislocated and the perspective of the imagery altered. Something like the following will show (Professor Jebb could show us much better) how the meaning might be given, and the order of words not seriously changed: 'Come there will, both many-footed and many-handed, one now lurking in dread ambush, adamantine-heeled Erinys.'

4. *ἐξεκίνησεν ποδοῖν*
στικτὸν κεράστην ἔλαφον, οὗ κατὰ σφαγὰς
ἐκκομπάσας ἔπος τι τυγχάνει βαλών. 567.

'He shot it, and chanced to utter a certain boast concerning its slaughter.'

'Concerning its slaughter' seems needlessly prosaic; and, after saying that Agamemnon killed the stag, it was unnecessary to add that he hit it. *βαλών*, then, must govern *ἔπος*, not *αὐτὸν* understood. Translate: and at its death, as he vaunted his exploit, an irreverent word chanced to escape his lips.'

5. *ἔπειτα λύων ἡνίαν ἀριστερὰν*
κάμπτοντος ἵππου λανθάνει στήλην ἄκραν
παίσας. 743.

A note says that, when the car had to turn round the goal from right to left, Orestes slackened the left rein a moment too soon, and that this caused the collision. On the authority of a mathematical friend Professor Jebb supposes that, when the left rein was slackened, the new force applied by the horse to the left side of the chariot would give it an angular velocity, *i.e.* would make it begin to rotate from left to right round its own centre, and thus would swing its hinder extremity towards the goal. Its hinder extremity, perhaps! But could rotation of the car round its own centre, which would be the longitudinal centre of the axle, bring the axle-head any nearer to the goal, and cause a crash? Indeed, the greatest chance of collision when the car was rounding the goal would be when the axle was in its normal position, *i.e.* when it was at right angles to the tangent of the goal, supposing the goal to be cylindrical. Any deflection from this position caused by an angular velocity would increase the distance of the axle-head from the goal, and instead of increasing, diminish the chance of contact. This explanation then of the catastrophe is inadmissible.

The proposal of other editors to substitute *τείνων* or *ἀνέλκων*, or some other equivalent, for *λύων* is more intelligible. This however is unnecessary if we notice the tenses of *λύων* and *παίσας*. 'Present tense,' as everyone knows, is only an appropriate name of a form in the indicative mood: in the participle the corresponding form would be more correctly termed the imperfect. *Λύων* accordingly means 'beginning to loosen,' 'proceeding to loosen,' 'setting about loosening.' Instead of slackening the rein a moment too soon, Orestes slackened it, or was going to slacken it, a moment too late; and the collision had occurred before the slackening was an accomplished fact; at least before the horse could take advantage of it. Orestes had pulled the chariot on to the goal. *Λύων*, in other words, is nearly equivalent to *λύσων*: if Sophocles had written *λύσας*, an angular velocity might have occurred, (as to that I bow to the mathematicians) and, whether it occurred or no, the disaster would have been inexplicable.

6. *φέροντες αὐτοῦ σμικρὰ λείψαν' ἐν βραχεῖ*
τεύχει θανόντος, ὡς ὁρᾷς, κομίζομεν. 1113.

'He is dead; and in a small urn, as thou seest, we bring the scanty relics home.'

This translation gives no force to *φέροντες* which from its position in the forefront of the statement should be its principal feature. To give the word its due weight we must render somewhat as follows: 'On our shoulders we are bringing his poor relics—all that death has left of him—in the narrow vessel which thou seest, to the place of his birth.' *Φέροντες*, governing no case, is here equivalent to an adverb (*φοράδην*), and per-

haps would suggest *ἐκφορὰ* (a funeral procession).

7. *ἀνέφελον ἐνέβαλες*
οὔποτε καταλύσιμον
οὐ δέ ποτε λησόμενον
ἀμέτερον οἷον ἔφυ κακόν. 1246.

'Thou hast reminded me of my sorrow, one which from its nature cannot be veiled, cannot be done away with, cannot forget.'

To show the difference in the construction of *ἀνέφελον* and the other epithets we should rather render:

'In cloudless daylight thou revealest how unforgiving, how unforgetting, is the nature of our sorrow': or, taking with Professor Jebb *οἷον ἔφυ* as a separate sentence:

'Into blaze of day thou flingest the wrongs we have endured, that, by their nature, can never be atoned, and never can forget.'

Ajax.

1. *ἐγώ σφ' ἀπείργω, δυσφόρους ἐπ' ὄμμασι*
γνώμας βαλοῦσα τῆς ἀνηκέστου χαρᾶς. 51.

'I, even I, withheld him, for I cast upon his eyes the tyrannous fancies of his baneful joy.'

It will be seen that, by the removal of a comma after *βαλοῦσα*, the genitive *χαρᾶς* is made to be governed by *γνώμας* instead of *ἀπείργω*. Ought not in such a case both or neither of the words to have an article? But, if the construction is possible, is it not a wanton injury to the style? Would any trick of elocution on the part of the actor make an Athenian audience suppose that such a construction was intended?

2. *φίλων γὰρ οἱ τοιοίδε νικῶνται λόγοις.* 330.

'Men in his case can be won by the words of friends.'

This may seem a fair translation of the Greek, and gives a sense which does not jar with the situation, and yet it is hardly what Tecmessa means. 'Can be won' is the gist of the English proposition; whereas *νικῶνται* by its position in the Greek is absolutely devoid of accentuation. As the play proceeds we shall see the way in which Ajax responded to the pleadings of a woman:

οὐκ ἐκτός; οὐκ ἄψορρον ἐκνεμεῖ πόδα;
ἄγαν γε λυπεῖς.
τοῖς ἀκούουσιν λέγε.
πόλλ' ἄγαν ἤδη θροεῖς.
μῶρά μοι δοκεῖς φρονεῖν. &c., &c.

The word *ἀνδρῶν* is not used by Tecmessa, who prefers the more honorific *φίλων*, but she means:

ἀνδρῶν γὰρ οἱ τοιοίδε νικῶνται λόγοις.

'Only male friends can influence natures like his.' In the Greek camp *ἀνδρῶν* would usually be a part of the connotation of *φίλων*; and the emphasis on the word implies that Tecmessa excludes herself, and probably her sex, from the orbit of its meaning. The Chorus afterwards remember her hint and say:

παῦσαί γε μέντοι, καὶ δὸς ἀνδράσιν φίλοις
γνώμης κρατῆσαι, τάσδε φροντίδας μεθείς.

3. *τί γὰρ παρ' ἦμαρ ἡμέρα τέρπειν ἔχει*
προσθεῖσα κἀναθεῖσα τοῦ γε κατθανεῖν;
475.

'What joy is there in day following day —now pushing us forward, now drawing us back, on the verge—of death?"

τοῦ κατθανεῖν is taken to be governed by *ἀναθεῖσα*, while a dative understood is governed by *προσθεῖσα*. A note paraphrases: 'what power to please him has each successive day when it has brought him close up to death, and then again moved him back from death.'

I do not understand what is meant by this alternate approach and recession of death. Is it not better to make *τοῦ γε κατθανεῖν* a genitive after *ἦμαρ* and *ἡμέρα*, and translate: 'what advantage has one day over another day, one accelerating, the other retarding, but both ushering in the same conclusion—death'? Παρὰ then will not suggest succession but comparison, as usual.

4. *κρείσσων γὰρ Ἅιδᾳ κεύθων ὁ νοσῶν μάταν.*
635.

Although Professor Jebb has amply illustrated the use of the participle with *κρείσσων* instead of the infinitive with *κρεῖσσον*; to show how deeply rooted this idiom was in the language I add an instance from Pindar: *ἄνευ θεοῦ δὲ σεσιγαμένον οὐ σκαιότερον χρῆμ' ἕκαστον.* Olymp. 9, 156. *i.e.* 'Every ill-starred enterprise were better (were not more inglorious) buried in silence.'

5. *ἆρ' ὑμὶν οὗτος ταῦτ' ἔδρασεν ἔνδικα;* 1282.

'Would ye allow that he did his duty there?'

But Teucer does not admit that Ajax owed any duty to the Atridae. His contention is that the exploits of Ajax were works of supererogation; and we may render; 'Were these deeds of this hero dues he owed to you?' *i.e.* 'Were these exploits a bounden service that you his lords could claim and owe him no thanks?' There is a contemptuous emphasis on *ὑμίν*.

Such are certain scruples that have occurred to my mind in reperusing a favourite author under Professor Jebb's guidance. To note all the solutions of difficulties, happy emendations of the text, and instructive discussions that are to be met with in these volumes would be an incomparably longer task.

E. Poste.

NOTES ON OEDIPUS TYRANNUS.

L. 227.

κεἰ μὲν φοβεῖται, τοὐπίκλημ' ὑπεξελεῖν
αὐτὸν καθ' αὑτοῦ.

In support of Professor Jebb's translation of *ὑπεξελεῖν*, 'to remove the danger...from his path,' may be cited the following passage from the *Ath. Pol.* ch. 35 § 4. *ἀλλ' ἀπέκτεινον τοὺς καὶ ταῖς οὐσίαις καὶ τῷ γένει καὶ τοῖς ἀξιώμασιν προέχοντας, ὑπεξαιρούμενοί τε τὸν φόβον καὶ βουλόμενοι τὰς οὐσίας διαρπάζειν.*

L. 324.

ὁρῶ γὰρ οὐδὲ σοὶ τὸ σὸν φώνημ' ἰὸν
πρὸς καιρόν· ὡς οὖν μηδ' ἐγὼ ταὐτὸν πάθω—.

Professor Jebb writes thus: '(*I* do not speak), for I see...,' and below, ('I do not speak), then, in order that *neither* (*μηδέ*) may I share your mishap (of speaking amiss).' Professor Campbell says, 'it is needless to suppose an aposiopesis.' In the first place, the words 'I do not speak' are to be supplied only at the *beginning* of the couplet; 'I withhold the response because (*γάρ*) etc.' In the second place, there is, I think, an aposiopesis, this being one of the passages where the sense is completed by the action on the stage. There is, therefore, a word to be supplied at the end of the couplet by the reader, viz. *ἄπειμι*, which is supplied to the spectator by the action of Teiresias, who turns as though to leave the stage, thus evoking from Oedipus the remonstrance, *μὴ πρὸς θεῶν...ἀποστραφῇς*. On the same passage Professor Jebb comments: '*φρονῶν γ'*, if thou hast understanding (of this matter); cp. 569.....But in 328 *οὐ φρονεῖτε*="are without understanding," "are senseless."' Surely this weakens the point. 'Turn not away,' cries Oedipus, 'if you know the truth, we all entreat you.' 'Yes,' replies the prophet, 'you all entreat, because *you* do *not* know the truth.' That is to say, the sense of *φρονεῖν* in both places is exactly the same.

L. 501.

σοφίᾳ δ' ἂν σοφίαν | παραμείψειεν ἀνήρ.

'I admit that one man may excel another in the art of interpreting omens according to the general rules of augural lore' (Jebb, *ad loc.*). But if such an art can produce true results, then the diviner does win knowledge above that of the chorus, which they have just asserted is not the case; if it cannot, it seems idle to say that one man may excel another in doing what when done has no useful result, and absurd to honour such empty superiority with the title of *σοφία*. Rather *σοφία* is 'wisdom' in its most general sense as opposed to divination altogether.

Ll. 715 *seqq.*

καὶ τὸν μὲν, ὥσπερ γ' ἡ φάτις, ξένοι ποτὲ
λῃσταὶ φονεύουσ' ἐν τριπλαῖς ἁμαξιτοῖς·
παιδὸς δὲ βλάστας οὐ διέσχον ἡμέραι
τρεῖς, καί νιν ἄρθρα κεῖνος ἐνζεύξας ποδοῖν
ἔρριψεν ἄλλων χερσὶν εἰς ἄβατον ὄρος.

No commentator has, as far as I know, pointed out the fact that Oedipus clearly hears nothing of this speech after line 716. Were it otherwise he must have at once identified himself by the reference to the piercing of his feet, a reference he is quick to understand at l. 1032. 'The mention of "*three roads*" has startled Oedipus,' says Professor Jebb, but it should be put more strongly. He is stunned by the words, and rendered wholly unconscious of what follows, and this was doubtless conveyed by the gestures of the actor.

L. 800.

καί σοι, γύναι, τἀληθὲς ἐξερῶ. τριπλῆς

In support of this line as against those who, with Dindorf and Nauck, would eject it, may be cited Virg. *Aen.* iv. 20, where Dido, when, like Oedipus here, approaching a confession, uses exactly similar language,

Anna, fatebor enim, miseri post fata Sychaei
Conjugis—cet.

Herbert W. Greene.

OVID'S *HEROIDES*.

(*Continued from p.* 106).

VII 23—26

Vror, ut inducto ceratae sulpure taedae,
ut pia fumosis addita tura rogis.
Aeneas oculis semper uigilantis inhaeret,
Aenean animo noxque diesque refert.

24 and 25 are found neither in P nor in G nor in more than a few of the other MSS.

The archetype itself contained many interpolated verses, which appear accordingly in P and G and all the rest. But some of the later MSS proffer new interpolations, from which P and G and many of the others are free. I here enquire whether, in spite of this fact, any of the later MSS preserve genuine verses which have been omitted by P and G.

Some of the inserted lines betray their spuriousness plainly in language or metre, as v 26 'est in qua nostri littera scripta memor' and iv 132[a] sq. 'Saturnus periit, perierunt et sua regna: | sub Ioue nunc mundus; iura Iouis sequere': such as these I leave alone. Nor shall I here discuss the couplets with which many MSS have filled up real or imaginary gaps at the opening of certain epistles. But I shall examine five places in the body of the poems where later MSS offer verses which are missing from the oldest.

First viii (Hermione) 19 sqq.

sit socer exemplo nuptae repetitor ademptae,
nupta foret Paridi mater, ut ante fuit.

So P and G and most MSS. In hopes of making sense, Merkel and others have altered *sit* to *si*, but have made no sense: the meaning is imagined to be 'if your father-in-law had set about reclaiming his bride in your fashion (*exemplo* for *tuo exemplo!*), my mother would have remained the bride of Paris': 'neque oratio constat (neque enim post *si* omitti *esset* aut *fuisset* potest) neque sententia ulla est' says Madvig. Mr Riese has another plan: '*sis* (socer exemplo *est*) nuptae repetitor ademptae: | nupta foret, Priami mater ut ante fuit?' The reader cannot construe this pentameter, so I must explain that Mr Riese intends it to signify 'ought your bride to be what my mother formerly was to Paris?' Now turn from these editors to a critic: Madvig adu. crit. i p. 46 'Ouidius scripserat: *sit socer exemplo nuptae repetitor ademptae* (sequere exemplum soceri tui); deinde excidit pentameter et hexameter ab *si* incipiens condicionemque continens (si, ut tu, lente raptam coniugem tulisset), cuius apodosis est in u. 22 *nupta foret Paridi mater, ut ante fuit.*' Well, a few late MSS give:

sit socer exemplo nuptae repetitor ademptae,
cui pia militiae causa puella fuit.
si pater ignauus uacua stertisset in aula,
nupta foret Paridi mater, ut ante fuit...

and these verses, in one form or another, are accepted by Heinsius and the old editors in general. The lines fill the gap which Madvig detects; they fill it with the sense which he requires; and they exhibit the homoearchon (*sit* 19, *si* 21) which explains their disappearance from the other MSS. But Burmann pointed out that *stertisset* (this is clearly the original reading: some MSS have the blunder *stetisset*, and others *sedisset* or *plorasset* as attempts to correct that blunder) is a false form for *stertuisset*. It is not indeed in itself suspicious; but Persius has *desterfuit*, and it is strange that Probus and Priscian, who quote that for *stertui*, should ignore *sterti* if *stertisset* stood in Ovid's heroides. To be sure, you might conjecture *iacuisset* and assume that the first half of the verb was absorbed by *uacua* and then restored amiss; but it is still perhaps a trifle clumsy that *socer* in 19 should mean '*your* father-in-law' and *pater* in 21 '*my* father'; and if with one MS you read *socer* in 21, that is worse, because *mater* in 22 ought then to mean '*your* mother.' Therefore I hesitate to say that these two verses, though they make good a real defect, are genuine.

Next I take the best authenticated instance. xiii (Laodamia) 73 sqq.

pugnet et aduersos tendat Menelaus in hostis:
hostibus e mediis nupta petenda uiro est.
causa tua est dispar.

Laodamia says that Menelaus has a reason for risking his life but Protesilaus has none. Not a word is wanting, and no one could suspect an error. But almost all the MSS, except the three oldest, P, G and V (frag. Vindobonense saec. xii), present the passage thus:

pugnet et aduersos tendat Menelaus in hostis,
ut rapiat Paridi quam Paris ante sibi;
irruat et, causa quem uicit, uincat et armis:
hostibus e mediis nupta petenda uiro est.

Heinsius thought these verses Ovid's, and in themselves they are quite Ovidian. Moreover there is no visible reason why an interpolator should insert them. But in this context they are alien and disturbing. The hexameter 75 with its irrelevant antithesis 'causa quem uicit, uincat et armis' serves merely to distract attention from Laodamia's argument. The pentameter 74 serves just the same purpose as 76, and therefore must be spurious if 76 is genuine. But it may be genuine if 76 is spurious; and surely 74 is much the better and more Ovidian pentameter of the two. I strongly suspect then that what Ovid wrote is this:

pugnet et aduersos tendat Menelaus in hostis,
ut rapiat Paridi quam Paris ante sibi.
causa tua est dispar.

And this is actually the reading of two Gotha MSS saec. xiii and xv. The variants will then be explained as follows. The true pentameter *ut rapiat*...was early lost and its place supplied by *hostibus e*...: this stage appears in P G V. Later the true pentameter was written in the margin; but then, in the copy from which most of our MSS descend, it was inserted, not instead of the false pentameter, but beside it, and an hexameter was manufactured to stand between them.

Come now to vii (Dido) 97 sqq.

exige, laese pudor, poenas, uiolate Sychaei,
ad quas, me miseram, plena pudoris eo.

For *Sychaei* some MSS have *Sychaeu* or *Sychaeo* or *Sychaee*. This distich is compact of vice: *pudoris* is impossible beside *pudor*, so Heinsius suggests *ruboris*; the style having been thus improved, what is to be the construction and the sense? if you read '*umbraeque* Sychaei' with Merkel or '*taedaeque* S.' with Mr Birt, those are violent changes; if you read with some old editors 'uiolate Sychaee, | ad *quem*', that is a violent change and a harsh asyndeton into the bargain. Now see how a very few late MSS relieve the passage of all its faults:

exige, laese pudor, poenas, uiolataque *leti*
iura nec ad cineres fama retenta meos,
uosque, mei manes, animaeque cinisque Sychaei,
ad quas, me miseram, plena pudoris eo.

I do not understand how anyone can doubt that this interpolator, if interpolator he is, has hit precisely on the seat of corruption: the scribe's eye glanced from a *que* in 97 to a *que* in 99 and he wrote

exige, laese pudor, poenas, uiolataque Sychaei,

which was then reduced to metre by the conjecture *uiolate* in agreement with 'pudor'. The sense too is just what Ovid must have given. *cinisque* in 99 cannot be right, and Bentley proposes *umbraeque* which might be lost after *animaeque:* for the expression compare met. viii 488 'fraterni manes animaeque recentes,' Verg. Aen. v 80 sq. 'recepti | nequiquam cineres animaeque umbraeque paternae', Sil. xiii 395 'manis animasque suorum'. If the lines are an interpolation, its ingenuity is amazing; but before we call them probably genuine let us take one instance more.

ii (Phyllis) 17 sqq.

saepe deos supplex, ut tu, scelerate, ualeres,
ipsa mihi dixi 'si ualet ille, uenit'.

This, as may be seen, is neither sense nor grammar. One MS, the old but very corrupt and interpolated Etonensis, saves the grammar and leaves the sense forlorn with the obvious and trumpery conjecture *diis* for *deos;* and one editor, Mr Palmer, proposes *deo* in emulation. Mr Palmer I believe is a student not only of Ovid but of Dickens; so I suppose that is the reason why he makes Phyllis talk like Mr F's Aunt. Now in the first Aldine edition (an. 1502) is given the following supplement:

saepe deos supplex, ut tu, scelerate, ualeres,
sum prece turicremis deuencrata focis ;
saepe, uidens uentos caelo pelagoque fauentes,
ipsa mihi dixi 'si ualet ille, uenit'.

Burmann also found the lines in two MSS: of MSS now known only one, Giessensis bibl. acad. 66 (saec. xiv), presents them, with the reading *cum prece turmoniis sum uenerata sacris.* Here is a deliverance indeed. The pentameter 'ipsa mihi' cet. is now no longer a maundering irrelevancy but apt and beautiful; the homoearchon *saepe* in 17 and 19 shows at a glance how the two lines were lost; and the diction, as Mr Sedlmayer points out prol. crit. p. 52, is thoroughly Augustan: the rare *turicremus* occurs in Ovid himself at ars iii 393 'turicremas...aras', and the rarer *deueneror* in Tib. i 5 14 'somnia ter sancta deuenerauda mola'. I heartily agree then with almost every editor old and new that the lines are Ovid's; and I wish the lesson taught by this passage to be remembered in dealing both with the passage last considered and with the passage from which I started and to which after this long circuit I now return, vii 23—26.

To begin with, 24 and 25 appear in the same cod. Giessensis which has preserved ii 18 and 19; but they appear also in seven other MSS of Mr Sedlmayer's, including the respectable Francofurtanus which is our chief authority for the epistula Sapphus. Necessary to the sense they are not; but that may be thought to tell in their favour, because there was nothing to prompt an interpolation. And if they are genuine there is a plain reason why they should fall out: *uror* and *ut*, *Aeneas* and *Aenean*. And further, it is surely much more Ovidian to give such different thoughts as the contents of 23 and 26 a distich apiece, than to crowd them in a single couplet. For all these reasons put together I think that 24 and 25 are genuine.

But still to admit them will entail one trifling change. In the distich 'Aeneas oculis semper uigilantis inhaeret, | Aenean animo noxque diesque refert' you cannot have day in both verses and night in the pentameter alone. Therefore I should emend the passage thus:

uror, ut inducto ceratae sulpure taedae,
ut pia fumosis addita tura rogis.
Aeneas oculis semper uigilantis inhaeret,
Aenean animo noxque *quiesque* refert.

There is perhaps some trace of this in P, which has not *diesque* but simply *dies*: that may mean that when 24 and 25 had been lost and the mention of day became necessary in 26, someone wrote *dies* in the margin, and P substituted this not for *quies*, like the other MSS, but for *quiesque*.

VII 73—78

Da breue saeuitiae spatium pelagique tuaeque:
grande morae pretium tuta futura uia est.
nec mihi tu curae: puero parcatur Iulo.
te satis est titulum mortis habere meae.
quid puer Ascanius, quid di meruere penates?
ignibus ereptos obruet unda deos?

The old vulgate of 75 was the 'nec mihi tu *parcas*' of many MSS, which gives a fair sense, though 'tu' is superfluous and worse: Heinsius introduced from a few MSS the much more elegant 'nec mihi *parcatur*'. He was acquainted with the 'nec mihi tu curae' of P and G, but of course he never dreamt of printing such nonsense. The modern editors all accept it, and evidently have no inkling that there is anything wrong. Yet what could be more preposterous? How can Dido pretend that she does not care for Aeneas? what in the world is she writing this epistle for? what does she mean by saying 22 'unde tibi, quae te sic amet, uxor erit?', 29 sq. 'non tamen Aenean, quamvis male cogitat, odi, | sed queror infidum questaque peius amo', 61 sq. 'perdita ne perdam, timeo, noceamue nocenti, | neu bibat aequoreas naufragus hostis aquas', 170 'dum tua sit Dido, quidlibet esse feret', 180 sqq. 'tempora parua peto, | dum freta mitescunt et amor..... | si minus, est animus nobis effundere uitam'? But I am almost ashamed to speak about a point so obvious.

Dido has been plying Aeneas with reasons against sailing: the weather is stormy; the sea is dangerous at the best of times; dangerous especially to oath-breakers; he can have a safer voyage if he will but wait. Now she goes on '*Even if you care nothing for these considerations*, at least have pity on your son'.

haec minus ut cures, puero parcatur Iulo.

hec min' ut cures for *nec mihi tu cure.* I have altered all four words; but the four

alterations together are only a trifle : *haec* and *nec* are much exchanged, *minus* and *mihi* at Plaut. truc. 900 and elsewhere, *ut* and *tu* just four lines back at 71, where Madvig restores *ut tum* for *tutum*, and many a time again. To write *nos* or *me* for *nec* is less easy : to write *nil*, which the scribes would spell *nihil*, for *mihi* is equally easy but has less of an Ovidian flow.

VII 81—86.

Omnia mentiris; nec enim tua fallere lingua
incipit a nobis primaque plector ego.
si quaeras ubi sit formosi mater Iuli,
occidit a duro sola relicta uiro.
haec mihi narraras : at me mouere ! merentem 85
ure : minor culpa poena futura mea est.

This reading of 86 (*ure* P, *inde* G, *illa* al.) and punctuation of the couplet have been rightly adopted by Madvig and the latest editors from Burmann. In 85 the above reading is that of the MSS with no considerable variation except that E and many others have *nouere* for the *mouere* of P and G. The required sense is well stated by Madvig : 'manifestum est intellectumque ab aliis, Dido se incusare, quod non admonita ipsius Aeneae de se narratione fraudem cauerit, poenamque non recusare'. The words are apparently supposed, by those who retain them, to signify : 'you told me this story : *it melted my heart !* torture me, for I deserve it : my punishment will be less than my fault'. But that 'me mouere' should mean anything of the sort is a flat impossibility. 'mouere' in itself is a word of neutral sense and means simply 'to produce an effect upon'. Here, where its subject is a tale of betrayal, its sense, if it ceases to be neutral, can only be 'to produce *its* effect (its natural effect) upon' : that is, 'to render mistrustful'. Therefore, if *mouere* is retained, *at* must be altered, with Burmann and a few MSS, to *nec* (I would not suggest *haut*) : 'you told me this story, yet it was wasted upon me',—therefore she deserves to suffer for her blindness.

Madvig on the other hand obtains equally good sense by writing '*di* me *monuere*' 'it was a warning from heaven'. I accept *monuere*, but I write with a slighter change

haec mihi narraras : *sat* me *monuere* : merentem ure cet.

'you told me this story : it gave me fair warning'. The cause of the corruption is obvious. The form *sat* already occurs once in the heroides at xii 75, and I shall have to introduce it once again.

VII 191—196.

Anna soror, soror Anna, meae male conscia culpae,
iam dabis in cineres ultima dona meos.
nec consumpta rogis inscribar Elissa Sychaei ;
hoc tamen in tumuli marmore carmen erit :
'praebuit Aeneas et causam mortis et ensem. 195
ipsa sua Dido concidit usa manu.'

The *tamen* of 194 has either an absurd meaning or none at all. *sed* would be sense : that would mean 'my epitaph shall not link my name with Sychaeus, but, on the contrary, with Aeneas'. *tamen* means 'my epitaph shall not link my name with Sychaeus, but, in spite of that, it shall link it with Aeneas' : which is ridiculous. Bentley, as you would expect, paid attention to this, and rendered *tamen* correct by changing the *nec* of 193 to *et :* that is, 'my epitaph shall link my name with Sychaeus, but, in spite of that, with Aeneas too'.

But the whole tenour of the epistle is surely in favour of *nec ;* so I would rather alter *tamen* itself :

hoc *tantum* in tumuli marmore carmen erit.

tantum and *tamen* are eternally confused, and no wonder, when the abbreviation *tm̃* means *tamen* in one MS and *tantum* in another. I think this *tantum* 'merely' is supported by fast. iii 547 sqq. where this epitaph of Dido is repeated word for word, with the introduction, also borrowed hence, 'tumulique in marmore carmen | hoc *breue*, quod moriens ipsa reliquit, erat'.

VIII 43—50.

Ille licet patriis sine fine superbiat actis,
et tu quae referas facta parentis habes.
Tantalides omnis ipsumque regebat Achillem : 45
hic pars militiae, dux erat ille ducum.

tu quoque habes proauum Pelopem Pelopisque parentem;
si medios numeres, a Ioue quintus eris.
nec uirtute cares. arma inuidiosa tulisti,
sed tu quid faceres? induit illa pater.

45. Instead of *regebat*, P has *petebat*, which I suspect to be, as it sometimes is, a corruption of *tenebat* 'commanded', possibly through *tepebat*. *regebat* may then be either a correction of *petebat*, or an explanation of *tenebat*, or a corruption of it, possibly through *tegebat*.

50. The required sense of 'tu quid faceres?' is not 'how could *you* help it?' but simply 'how could you help it?' so the pronoun only cumbers the ground. The required sense of 'induit illa pater' is 'your father put those arms upon you', but it cannot have the required sense: it signifies 'your father put those arms upon himself': 'induo arma' without a dative means 'induo arma mihi', not 'alteri'. Repair the defect by discarding the superfluity:

sed *tibi* (quid faceres?) induit illa pater.

See ars i 197 'induit armâ tibi genitor patriaeque tuusque'.

VIII 55—60.

Increpat Aeacides laudemque in crimina uertit,
et tamen aspectus sustinet ille meos.
rumpor et ora mihi pariter cum mente tumescunt
pectoraque inclusis ignibus usta dolent.
Hermione coram quisquam obiecit Oresti,
nec mihi sunt uires nec ferus ensis adest?

59 is thus written by the first hand of P; the first hand of G omits the verse; the second hands of both, which are entirely worthless, amend the metre with *quisquamne*. But *obiecit* remains doubly vicious: it is perfect when it ought to be present; and it lacks an accusative, though no example is quoted of the absolute use of the verb. Therefore, if there were reason to think *quisquamne* the true reading, I should remove these two vices by altering *obiecit* to *obtrectat*.

But the *ne* has no authority, and other MSS give *quisquam haec* and *si quisquam* and *si quicquam* and *quicquamne*: it is quite evident that the line was metrically deficient in the archetype, as it is in P, and has been variously but unskilfully mended. To get rid of all its faults, not in metre only but in sense and grammar too, I propose

Hermione coram quicquam obiecit <alter> Orestae?

alt-er would easily vanish between *ecit* and *or*. *obiĕcit* = *obicit*.

A. E. Housman.

(*To be continued.*)

EMENDATIONS OF LUCRETIUS.

As the corrections of Lucretius' text which I have proposed at various times are scattered over the volumes of the *Cambridge Journal of Philology* from 1871 to the present time, I have thought it worth while to present them collectively, here, with the number of the *Journal*, and the year appended, for the convenience of readers.

I. 554, 5

Ut nil ex illis a certo tempore posset
Conceptum summum aetatis peruadere †finis.

Read *fini* 'nothing could reach through the crowning-point of life with an end,' *i.e.* pass through the stages of birth and consummation to destruction.

J. of Philol. xv. p. 10 (1886).

II. 43

Ornatas armis †statuas pariterque animatas.

Statuas is accus. plur., not 2nd. pers. pres. subj.

J. of Philol. xiv. 90 (1885).

II. 553

Disiectare solet magnum mare transtra †cauerna.

Read *cauernas*, as in Cic. *de Orat.* iii. 180 Quid tam in nauigio necessarium quam latera quam cauernae, quam prora, quam puppis, quam antennae, quam uela, quam mali? and cf. Serv. on *Aen.* ii. 19 Alii fustes curuos nauium quibus extrinsecus tabulae adfiguntur cauernas appellarunt.

J. of Philol. xiv. 90 (1885).

II. 1162

Conficimus ferrum uix aruis †suppeditati.

Read *suppetiati.*

J. of Philol. vii. 250 (1877). Noct. Manil. p. 250.

IV. 633

ut uideamus perhaps should be retained.

J. of Philol. xvii. 140.

IV. 638

†Est itaque ut serpens hominis quae tacta saliuis
Disperit ac sese mandendo conficit ipsa.

Read *Excetra ut est serpens.*

J. of Philol. xii. 259 (1883).

IV. 896, 7

hic igitur rebus fit utrimque duabus
†Corporis ut ac nauis uelis uentoque feratur.

Read *Conpare ut hac*, sc. mole corporis protrusi atque moti, 'Hereupon it happens to the two things acting in their several ways, that the motion of a ship by sails and wind has its counterpart in this motion of the mass of the body.'

J. of Philol. xviii. 271 (1890). Noct. Manil. p. 57.

IV. 1129, 1130

Et bene parta patrum fiunt anademata mitrae
Interdum in pallam atque †alidensia ciaque uertunt.

Read *Aledensia* = Maledensia from Maledos, presumably an Epirotic (Varr. R.R. ii. 2, 1) town, whence a fine sort of wool was exported: *Cia* is to be explained of the Cean breed of sheep, which was highly prized and sold for extravagant prices. Ael. H.A. xvi. 32.

J. of Philol. xvii. p. 139 and 142 (1888).

V. 311, 312

Denique non monumenta uirum delapsa uidemus
Quaerere proporro sibi cumque senescere credas?

Read *Aeraque* (Munro) *proporro silicumque senescere petras.*

J. of Philol. iii. 267 (1871).

V. 396

Ignis enim superauit et †ambens multa perussit.

Retain *ambens* = 'compassing,' and restore *ambens* to Stat. Theb. iii. 443 for *amens* of most MSS.

J. of Philol. xv. p. 10 (1886).

V. 881

Hinc illinc par uis ut non sat (sit A) pars esse potissit.

Read *Hinc illinc par uis ut* { *non* / *sat* } *par esse potissit:* 'so that from these limbs or those should come an equal force which at the same time is *not* equal (or, which is equal enough to form the proper equipoise); *i.e.* that the human and the equine part of a centaur should coexist in a form which ought to be equal, but, as a fact, cannot be, owing to the different circumstances of the man's and the horse's growth, maturity, etc. Cels. iii. 8 *ut quod idem est, non idem esse uideatur.* Two readings seem to have been conflated into one.

J. of Philol. iii. p. 275 (1871).

V. 1442

Tum mare ueliuolis florebat propter odores.

Read *Tum mare ueliuolis proreis florebat opertum.* Stat. Achill. i. 443 feruent portus et operta carinis Stagna.

J. of Philol. xviii. 271 (1890).

To these I may add my article on B. VI., which appeared in *J. of Philol.* iii. pp. 260–277 (1871).

ROBINSON ELLIS.

THREE NEW FRAGMENTS OF CICERO.

I CANNOT find that the following fragments have been incorporated in any edition of Cicero. I cite from the seventh volume of the quarto edition of Jerome, published at Venice in 1769.

comm. in ep. ad Galat. 3 1 (col. 416[e]):
Graecos leves apud C. Caesarem suggillat Tullius dicens: *aut levium Graecorum aut immanium barbarorum.* et pro Flacco: *ingenita* inquit *levitas et erudita vanitas.*

prologus in translationem homiliarum xxxix Origenis in Lucam (col. 245-246):
petistis ut, contemptis istiusmodi nugis, saltem triginta et novem Adamantii nostri in Lucam homilias, sicut in Graeco habentur, interpreter: molestam rem et tormento similem, *alieno*, ut ait Tullius, *stomacho et non suo scribere:* quam tamen idcirco nunc faciam, quia sublimiora non poscitis. This interesting example of *stomachus* is unknown to the lexicons and to Otto (*Sprichwörter*). The meaning may be illustrated by another passage of Jerome (ep. 82 11 vol. i col. 520 d e):
sit talis, qualis ante fuit, quando nos suo arbitrio diligebat. *verba ei de alieno stomacho non fluant.* faciat quod vult, et non quod velle compellitur.

Further on in the prologue just cited is a reminiscence of Horace (c. iii 27 11):
praetermisi paululum Hebraicarum quaestionum libros, ut ad arbitrium vestrum [he is addressing Paula and Eustochium] lucrativis operis haec, qualiacumque sunt, non mea sed aliena dictarem: praesertim cum a sinistro *oscinem corvum* audiam crocitantem, et mirum in modum de cunctarum avium ridere coloribus, cum totus ipse tenebrosus sit.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

NOTE ON LUCAN VIII 7.

The context of this passage, describing Pompey's flight after he had passed Larissa [vii 712–24], is as follows:

pavet ille fragorem
motorum ventis nemorum, comitumque suorum
qui post terga redit trepidum laterique timentem
exanimat.

The word *redit* has naturally given trouble to commentators. Burman tries to explain it as = 'resounds,' carrying on *fragor* from *fragorem* above. Yet the corrections *ferit venit ruit* are not even plausible. Let me first inquire what is the detail added to the picture by the words *qui post terga redit.* Is the man who startles Pompey (*a*) joining the party from the direction of Pharsalus, and so catching them up, or (*b*) turning back to rejoin them with news from the front, having gone on as a scout to see that all was clear ahead? The former makes sense; but can *post terga redit* mean *fugientem sequitur*? If we press *redit* and suppose that the man is rejoining the party, having dropped behind for a time, the sense is to my mind forced and trivial. But, if we take the man to be a scout in advance, we get a new and graphic detail. Every time the scout comes back to report any news from the front, Pompey is startled by the thought 'here it is at last: our flight is cut off.' This assumes that *post terga redit* means turning back from the general direction of his course. Not very different is I 230 *missa Parthi post terga sagitta*, where the Parthian rides one way and shoots the other. In short *post terga* with a verb of motion is nearly equal to *in terga.* Can this view be maintained?

Reading lately the *Johannis* of Corippus, I have been struck with the frequent use of *post tergum* and *post terga* in this very sense. Corippus is a notorious imitator of Lucan. He is unfortunately often obscure, but I think the following passages are clear so far as the particular phrase goes.

III 229 *post tergum rediere viri* [? having drunk of the stream, they rejoined the main body], 239–40 *quaerunt dum prendere cautes, post tergum redeunt* [? the climbing down the rocks has the effect of a retreat]. IV 178 *flexit equum post terga fugax* [turned his horse and fled]. 189 *sed nullus post terga redit* [once started in flight, they would not rally at his call]. V 12–3 *domitum post terga reflectens cornipedem frenis* [he turned his horse and rode back again]. 278 *impulerat-que duces terror post terga redire.* VI 462–3

seu fessus Ilaguas conversus post terga redit. 681–2 *acies pulsae terrore magistri post tergum redeunt.* 758–9 *nigras equus horruit algas, et pavidus post terga redit.* VIII 596 *voluitque in terga redire.* Now *in terga* seems to be the opposite of *in faciem.* And in VI 439–41 we read of the beset Africans

via nulla salutis
et nullum monstratur iter. *post terga* Johannes,
in faciem nimius solis calor.

Here the antithesis is plain, though there is here no verb of motion, and the passage is not quite in line with the rest. Compare the construction with *respicere,* as *Bellum Africum* 80 § 5 where a force is ordered to raise a shout in the rear of the enemy *ut perturbati ac perterriti respicere post terga cogerentur.* Between Lucan and his sixth century follower I have as yet not found anything bearing on the passage under discussion. But I can hardly suppose that this one passage of Lucan led Corippus to use *post terga* = *in terga* as a regular expression. Is it possible that we have here a fragment of military slang—army-Latin?

W. E. Heitland.

KRUMBACHER'S BYZANTINE LITERATURE.

Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches (527–1453). Von Karl Krumbacher. A.O. Professor an der Universität München. Second Edition. (Unter Mitwirkung von A. Ehrhard und H. Gelzer). Munich, 1897. 24 M.

Six years ago I had the pleasure of welcoming in this *Review* the History of Byzantine Literature. If a prophet had declared then that within five years the book would be out of print and that within six we should have in our hands a second edition enlarged to more than double the size of the first, we should have regarded the prediction as absurd, in view of the notorious unpopularity of the subject. But so it has fallen out, and Byzantium must be congratulated. The right word to describe Professor Krumbacher's work must be sought in his own tongue; it is, in the fullest sense of the phrase, 'bahnbrechend.' And Professor Krumbacher has had the good fortune to see it recognized as such by all those who are competent to judge. Professor Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, whose praise is rare and precious, was not extravagant when he said that Krumbacher had almost created a new science. The labour involved in any work conceived on this scale would be vast; but, with Professor Krumbacher's high ideal of thoroughness and accuracy, it must have been simply enormous. There have been a few dissentient voices amid the chorus of praise by which Krumbacher's services have been applauded; there have been a few howls from the impostors whom he has exposed. But the scurrilities of an Albert Jahn are as harmless as his commendation would be worthless.

The new edition has been increased in three ways. Professor Gelzer of Jena has contributed a succinct sketch of the Byzantine Kaisergeschichte (from A.D. 395 to 1453) in about 150 pages; and Professor Ehrhard of Würzburg has treated the theological and hagiographical literature in somewhat less than 200 pages. Gelzer's name is a sufficient guarantee of the value of his contribution; I hope to have an opportunity of saying something about it elsewhere. The work of Ehrhard forms a most important addition to the book. It is divided into six sections: A. Dogmatik und Polemik; B. Exegese; C. Asketik und Mystik; D. Geistliche Beredsamkeit; E. Hagiographie; F. Katenen (= σειραί, systematic selections from ecclesiastical writers). It will form an excellent introduction to the scarce trodden regions of the literature of the Greek Church; of which if any one thinks that he knows anything from reading the standard Church Histories, let him look into Ehrhard's pages and he will find that he knows nothing. It may be added that Professor Ehrhard has recently made a most important original contribution to the subject of Greek hagiography by his study on the composition of the Collection of Symeon Metaphrastes.[1]

Thirdly, and chiefly, the author has added

[1] Die Legendensammlung des Symeon Metaphrastes und ihr ursprünglicher Bestand. (In the Festschrift zum elfhundertjährigen Jubiläum des deutschen Campo Santo in Rom., p. 46 *sqq.*). 1897.

to his own work 350 pages. Much of this additional material is due to the extraordinary activity of Byzantine research during the last six years. In this activity Professor Krumbacher has had a large share both direct and indirect; it was helped forward by his Literature, and stimulated and concentrated by the foundation of his *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, which led to the institution of the Russian *Vizantiski Vremennik*. But apart from the abundance of new investigations, the bibliography of older works has been largely increased; and the author's studies of MSS. in many libraries have supplied much material. A new section is added on special sciences (medicine, astronomy, mathematics, zoology, law etc.). And here I may record the only complaint I have to make—a complaint which concerns the external form. The book is far too bulky, for a book of constant reference. Why was it not divided at page 638, and brought out in two volumes?

On the bibliography Professor Krumbacher has spent enormous pains, and there is probably hardly anything of any importance that has escaped his notice. There is perhaps no form of research that involves so much pure waste of time as bibliography, and our obligation is all the greater for such a sacrifice. In the *Allgemeine Bibliographie* (p. 1069 *sqq.*), I may call attention to a few small points. P. 1070. The fifth and sixth vols. of Hodgkin's Italy and her Invaders appeared in 1895, so that the notice should be: '376–741, six vols. Oxford 1880–1895.' P. 1072 (Unter-Italien). Add M. Schipa, *La migrazione del nome 'Calabria,'* Archivio storico per le province napoletane, 1895, ann. 20, p. 23 *sqq.*, P. 1073. To the works on the fourth century should be added Seeck's important article on Synesius (in Philologus, 52, p. 442 *sqq.*), where he has conclusively, as it seems to me, identified the mysterious Typhos of the 'Aegyptian' with Caesarius. Also Seeck's paper, *Die Verwandtenmorde Constantins des Grossen*, Ztsch. für wiss. Theologie, 1890, Bd. 33, s. 63 ff. *Ib.* l. 13 from foot; Eudoxia is a misprint for Eudokia. *Ib.* To the sixth century should be added Mr. Bryce's long article on Justinian in the Dictionary of Christian Biography; and either here or in the paragraph on Southern Italy (p. 1072) might be mentioned von Schubert's *Unterwerfung der Alamannen*. Here too should come H. H. Howorth's *The Avars* (1889, published in the *Journal of the Royal Asiat. Soc.*, Third Series vol. 1), which contains a full history of the relations of this people with the Empire and discusses their origin. P. 1077. It might have been added with advantage that the work of Ch. Mijatovich, *Constantine, the last emperor of the Greeks*, is characterised by ignorance of Greek; and on p. 1085 much the same might be said of Stückelberg's *Der konstantinische Patriciat*, for which 'ungenügend' is hardly strong enough. P. 1078 D; I may note a paper of my own, *Charles the Great and the Empress Irene*, published in Hermathena, 1891. P. 1086, D. Add Mommsen, Protectores Augusti, Ephem. Epigr. V. 121 *sqq.* P. 1107, M; Xénopol's Histoire des Roumains de la Dacie Trajane (1896) must have appeared just too late to be recorded. *Ib.* N. Add C. Grot, Moravia i. Madiari s polovini ix do nachala x vieka (Warsaw). P. 1099 G. Add R. von Scala, Ueber die wichtigsten Beziehungen des Orients zum Occidente. P. 1109. Add Arthur J. Evans, Antiquarian Researches in Illyricum, 1883 and 1885 (very important). P. 1106 L. Add, on the Tetraxite Goths, Vasilievski, Zhitie Ioanna Gotskago, in Journ. Min. 1878 Bd. 195, s. 105 ff.; and the same reference should be given in the notice of the Biography of Johannes of Gotthia on p. 197.

It is quite impossible in a bibliography on such a large scale always to go behind titles. What is professedly a work on one writer may have great importance for the study of other writers, and should consequently be mentioned under their names. Thus we miss under Zonaras a mention of the article of S. P. Shestakov on Candidus (in the Odessa *Lietopis* for 1894), which throws light on Zonaras B. xiv. (and also concerns Theophanes and Nicephorus Callistus).

Prof. Krumbacher refers to the Ἰταλοελληνικά of S. Zampelios, but not to his Βυζαντιναὶ Μελέται (Athens, 1857), a series of essays, dealing especially with the Iconoclasts and with the relations of the Eastern Empire with the West. They have a right to a place in his bibliography (under various heads) and some of them are still worth consulting. As the book is little known, it may be useful to give a list of the contents. (1) *συστατικὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς Βυζαντινῆς κοινωνίας* (deals with the demes, guilds, etc.) p. 65. (2) *πνευματικὴ ἀνεξαρτησία τοῦ Ἑλληνισμοῦ*, p. 96. (3) Ἡράκλειος, p. 114. (4) Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ κατάστασις, p. 127. (5) Μωάμεδ καὶ Σαρακηνοί, p. 167. (6) Λέων ὁ Ἴσαυρος. (7) Εἰκονομαχία. (8) *τὰ κατὰ τὴν* Ἰταλίαν (sc. in the eighth century), p. 252. (9) Φράγκων ἐπέμβασις, p. 274. (10) Βασι-

λεία Κωνσταντίνου (sc. Constantine V.), p. 292. (11) Παπισμοῦ προαγωγή, p. 327. (12) Εἰρήνη καὶ μέγας Κάρολος, p. 355. (13) Ἀνατολῆς καὶ Δύσεως ὁροθεσία, p. 396. (14–16) σχέσεις τῶν δύο αὐτοκρατοριῶν, p. 428. (17) πρεσβεία Λιντπράνδου, p. 518. (18) Γλώσσης περιπέτειαι, p. 574–682.

P. 94, in the enumeration of the theologi- works of Blemmydes, "Die Vita Pauli vom Berge Latros ist aus diesem Verzeichnis [d. h. des Demetrakopoulos] zu streichen.' The reasons should be given; for the Life of Paulus Junior in Cod. Paris. 1195 is distinctly ascribed to Blemmydes and appears thus in Omont's Catalogue. The reasons will be found in the preface to Delehaye's edition of the *Vita S. Pauli junioris in Monte Latro*, 1892.

P. 236, 3. In the preface to my ed. of Gibbon, vol. 1, I have retracted the view (referred to by Krumbacher) as to the authorship of the Secret History of Procopius and have signified my general acceptance of the conclusions of Haury; which the very thorough treatment of the contents of the work by Panchenko in the last few numbers of the *Vizantiski Vremennik* has gone to confirm.

P. 404, Zacharias of Mytilene (the genuine Books, 3–6) was translated and printed privately in 1892 by Dr. F. J. Hamilton under the title *The Ecclesiastical History of Zacharias Rhetor*. This version, revised, will appear in the series of Methuen's Byzantine Texts, along with the most important parts of the Chronicle in which this work of Zacharias was incorporated.

Nothing can be better or clearer than Prof. Krumbacher's summing up of the still unsettled controversies in Byzantine Literature; for example, the sections headed Johannes Malalas (§ 140), Johannes von Antiochia (§ 141), Georgios Monachos (§ 147). As it is quite impossible, within the limits of a short review, to go through even one division of this immense work, it will be more profitable to make some remarks on one of these vexed questions, and offer a small contribution to the subject.

The labour that has been expended on the 'Malalasfrage' has not been in vain. A number of conclusions have been solidly established; and a certain amount of agreement has been attained. It is indeed a remarkable example of a puzzle being gradually solved, not by the ingenuity of a single man, but by the labours of a great many independent workers approaching the question from different points of view. Among those who have made contributions may be specially mentioned Mommsen, Sotiriadis, Gelzer, Patzig, Noack, E. W. Brooks, Shestakov, and most recently C. E. Gleye. The following are the main points which may be regarded as definitely settled:

(1) The author of the chronicle preserved in Cod. Barocc. 128, who is called Johannes Malálas (= rhetor) by John of Damascus, is identical with Johannes Rhetor (= malálas) cited by Evagrius. (This identification is accepted by Krumbacher, and has been proved to demonstration in the very important article of Gleye in Byz. Ztsch., 1896, Bd. 5, 422 *sqq.*).

(2) Johannes Malalas wrote in the sixth century between A.D. 530 and 540. Whether he was also writing as late as A.D. 565–575, cannot be determined.

(3) Johannes Malalas is a distinct person from Johannes of Antioch — whether we identify with this name the Salmasian (so Patzig) or the Constantinian excerpts. Johannes of Antioch was subsequent to Malalas.

(4) The text which we possess (in the Oxford MS.) is only an abridgment of the original Chronicle of Malalas. But in a variety of excerpts, in the Slavonic versions, in later authors who used the original Malalas, we have a great deal of material for restoring large parts of the Chronicle to their primitive form.

(5) The Chronicle is not all of a piece. It appeared in two editions, of which the first contained only Books 1–17 and a few pages of Bk. 18 (up to p. 429, 9 ed Bonn), ending with the first months of A.D. 528. The paragraph from p. 428, 8, to 429, 9, formed the *epilogue* to this edition (as Gleye has rightly pointed out, op. cit.), which was published before A.D. 540. A second edition bringing the work up to date appeared in the reign of Justin. This came down at least as far as Justinian's death in the year A.D. 565. In this edition not only was new matter added, but some changes were made in the older work. *E.g.* what originally formed the end of Bk. 17 (namely the first acts of Justinian and the epilogue) were placed at the beginning of the new Book 18, and in the notice of the accession of Justinian (p. 425) the number of years of his reign was added. (The establishment of these facts is chiefly due to Mr. Brooks, M. Shestakov, and Dr. Gleye).

These conclusions lead of course to new questions. Was the second edition brought out by Malalas himself, and was he the author of the eighteenth Book? In regard to this, it is to be observed that the eighteenth

Book seems to have been written at Constantinople and not like the earlier part of the work at Antioch. It is also to be remembered that Malalas was a monophysite and that his work was subsequently revised by an orthodox editor, who cut out and altered the utterances of the author's theological opinions, but failed to obliterate all the traces of the cloven hoof. What then was the relation of this orthodox redaction to the new edition after the death of Justinian?

In connexion with this problem C. E. Gleye has collected considerable evidence to show that the second edition was considerably abbreviated (loc. cit. 430–441). His conclusions may be put thus. So far as Books 1–17 are concerned, the text of Cod. Barocc. represents the abridgment of an abridgment; for Book 18, it is the abridgment of the original work. We have in fact to distinguish three redactions of Books 1–17: (*a*) the original work (coming down to the first year of Justinian) which was used in this shape by Evagrius; (*b*) an edition largely abbreviated and modified, augmented by Book 18, and published after A.D. 565. This edition was used by author of Chron. Pasch., by Theophanes etc. (*c*) The abridgment preserved in the Oxford MS. I may mention one item in the evidence which Dr. Gleye has adduced. Evagrius using Malalas (Johannes Rhetor) notices the foundation of Daras. But the form of the name in our Malalas is Doras, not merely in the Cod. Barocc. (which, by the way, has τὰ δοράς, not τὸ δοράς) but in the edition used by Chron. Pasch. and the Slavonic translator. It would be hard to prove that Evagrius did not on his own account write Daras, instead of Doras in his source; but, when we take this case in connexion with others, it seems probable that Malalas wrote Daras, and that Doras (with the etymology δόρυ) was introduced in the later redaction. If the arguments of Gleye sustain the criticism of further research, they might lead to an important conclusion. They suggest that the true Johannes Rhetor or Malalas wrote his chronicle, as we should expect from a professor of rhetoric, in the Greek prose which educated writers used, and that the redactor who uttered the second edition transformed the style into the 'naive volkstümliche Gräzität' which makes it such an important monument from a linguistic point of view.

But there are difficulties. Although the eighteenth Book takes us into the atmosphere of Constantinople, the Antiochene author seems to accompany us for a few years. In the first place, we find immediately after the Epilogue, the formula ὡς προεῖπον, 'as I said above' (p. 429, 10). A Byzantine Continuer does not usually attempt to pose as the original author. Next, we have the notice of Antioch (p. 443–4), which suggests local knowledge and interest. Then we have the remarkably full account of the Persian War (p. 460–471), which gives the impression of having been written by one who followed its course from Syria rather than from Constantinople. Further, there is a curious notice in the Paschal Chronicle, which has a bearing on Malalas. That Chronicler followed Malalas in his description of the massacre in the hippodrome on the last day of the Nikariot. Thirty-five thousand people were slaughtered, and out of that vast multitude the name of only one is handed down to fame. The circumstance that the victim who is thus singled out was a man of Antioch is surely of great significance. There can be no doubt, I think, that the Paschal Chronicler derived the fact from Malalas; and therefore the Antiochene influence is still present in the first part of the eighteenth Book.

Another question is; where did the second edition of the Chronicle end? The Latin Laterculus in Cod. Vat. 277 (recently published by Mommsen, Chron. Min., 3, p. 424 *sqq.*), which was based on the Chronicle of Malalas, ends not with Justinian, but with the ninth year of Justinii. ('Iustinus regn ann viiii.' p. 437). Hence it is inferred that Malalas ended with the ninth year of Justin. I think Professor Krumbacher is prudent in showing some reserve about accepting this inference. I feel considerable difficulty in admitting that the Chronicle from which the Cod. Barocc. was abridged went beyond A.D. 565. There is only one fol. missing at the end of the Cod. Barocc., and any one who knows the large writing of the scribe of that MS. will find it hard to believe that—every allowance being made for the use of contractions which he began to adopt in the penultimate folio—he could have compressed nine years of Justin as well as the last three years of Justinian into the space. It therefore seems to me practically certain that the second edition went down only to the death of Justinian; and we may suppose that the original Latin epitome of Malalas on which our Laterculus (composed in the eighth century) depends was drawn up in A.D. 574–5 and that the Latin compiler added *suo marte* the nine years of Justin. Perhaps he regarded

Justin's reign as at an end, when Tiberius was proclaimed Caesar; for Justin had practically retired from the administration, and it is noteworthy that Menander dates events in 576 not by the years of Justin but by the years of Tiberius Caesar (fr. 43 *περὶ τὸ δεύτερον ἔτος τῆς Τιβερίου Καίσαρος ἡγεμονίας*, cp. fr. 42, Müller p. 244).

Professor Krumbacher is hardly right in saying (here he has followed Patzig) that the Paschal Chronicler used a Malalas which ended with the seventeenth Book. I had long ago satisfied myself that Patzig's argument in his first Program (Unerkannt und unbekannt gebliebene Malalas-fragmente, p. 15–17), to prove this thesis, was false, and could be refuted from the very episode on which he himself attempts to base it,—the episode of the Nika-revolt. Dr. Gleye came to the same conclusion and, as he has set forth his reasons (op. cit. p. 441 *sqq.*), I need not go into the question here. But on the other hand, I think that Dr. Gleye seems inclined to exaggerate the compass of the narrative of 'Malalas' in its original form. He seems disposed to think (though he admits that he cannot prove) that 'the eighteenth Book of the Malalas-work was the sole source of both Chron. Pasch. and Theophanes.' The reverse, I think, may be shown clearly from Theophanes.

A clumsy compiler like Theophanes distinguishes himself from a clever compiler like Zonaras, by inability to hide the sutures of his patch-work. Now it seems to me that there can be no clearer or stronger presumption of the use of different authorities than when a compiler introduces a new preface or introductory formula in the middle of a narrative. But this is what we find in the account of the Nika revolt by Theophanes. He begins with a general Introduction containing a summary of the whole episode (the coronation of Hypatius, the burning of the city, the slaughter of the people in the Hippodrome) taken straight from Theodorus Lector (= Cramer, An. Par. ii. p. 112):

τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει . . . . . γέγονε τοῦ λεγομένου Νίκα ἡ ἀνταρσία. Then follows the summary; and then we meet a *second Introduction*, *γέγονε δὲ ἡ ἀταξία τοῦ Νίκα τρόπῳ τοιούτῳ*, followed by the famous conversation in the Hippodrome (ed. de Boor p. 181). But after this scene, Theophanes begins anew with a *third Introduction* (de Boor, p. 184 l. 3); and this third preface corresponds to the words in which 'Malalas' (p. 473, 5) introduces his narrative.

The MSS. of Theophanes have the *μαϊστόρων*, which has no meaning here, and should obviously be corrected to *ἀλαστόρων*.

The inference is that at this point Theophanes passed from another source to the Malalas Chronicle, and awkwardly adopted the prefatory words of the latter, just as he had before passed from Theodorus Lector to this second source and, less awkwardly, adopted its opening words. If the altercation in the Hippodrome had been in the original Malalas Chronicle, it would have followed, and not preceded, these prefatory words, and it is quite inconceivable, that Theophanes would have deliberately composed a new preface and then inserted the introductory formula of Malalas out of its order. Theophanes and the Paschal Chronicler, who gives a very short notice of this altercation, had a second source (a Constantinopolitan Chronicle) before them.

This argument is confirmed by the noteworthy fact that Theophanes, though copying 'Malalas,' omits altogether the remarkable second scene in the Hippodrome on the Ides of January, which is described by 'Malalas' (p. 474). This was the occasion on which the Blues and Greens combined; it was a far more important occasion than the other. Why has Theophanes omitted it? The only intelligible reason is that he confused the two occasions and thought 'Malalas' was here describing more briefly the same negotiations which had been related more fully by his other source. If 'Malalas' had contained the earlier Dialogue also, there would have been no temptation to confuse the two scenes, and consequently no reason to omit the second.

While I am on the subject of the relation of Theophanes to Malalas, I may take the opportunity of pointing out a method to which not only compilers but historians sometimes resort, and to which in one instance Theophanes has resorted with the result of leading his critics astray. Under the year 571–2, in the reign of Justin, Theophanes describes the embassy of Julian, an imperial messenger (*μαγιστριανός*), to Arethas king of the Axumites, and his reception at that king's court. Now 'Malalas' described in identical words under the year 530, in the reign of Justinian, the mission of an unnamed ambassador to Elesboas king of the Axumites. The object of both missions was the same,—to incite Axum against Persia, and was in both cases successful. Now it is always assumed that Theophanes has simply misdated by forty years the event described by 'Malalas.' I

am utterly unable to imagine how such a misdating could have happened, except by the assumption of an accidental transposition of pages in the copy of Malalas which Theophanes consulted—assuming 'Malalas' to have come down to the ninth year of Justin's reign. It need hardly be said that this is an extremely unlikely assumption and could not be entertained without other evidence. But there are decisive objections against the theory of a mere confusion of dates. (1) The names of the kings are different; one is Elesboas, the other is Arethas. (2) The names of the envoys are different. The envoy sent by Justinian to Elesboas has no name in Malalas, but we know from other sources that he was Nonnosus; whereas the name of the envoy, who according to Theophanes was sent by Justin, is Julian. We are therefore not justified in identifying the two missions (as is generally done and as M. Duchesne does in his valuable study: *Eglises séparées*, p. 329); and the later mission in the reign of Justin is perfectly credible in view of the charge brought against the Romans by Chosroes: *τοὺς Ὁμηρίτας πρὸς ἀπόστασιν ὑπ' αὐτῶν ὑποπείθεσθαι*. Julian was, no doubt, sent to the Homerite court as well. The point is that Theophanes borrowed the language in which Malalas described the mission of Nonnosus, and applied it to the mission of Julian. Perhaps he even confounded Homerites and Axumites. In the same way the great Gibbon himself, in his narrative of the battle in which the Emperor Decius fell, has 'ventured to copy from Tacitus the picture of a similar engagement between a Roman army and a German tribe.'

But I must return to Professor Krumbacher's book. The notices of MSS. are far more frequent and abundant in the second edition than in the first. When the time comes for the preparation of a third edition, it would be well worth while to aim at giving for every writer as complete a list as possible of all the extant MSS. of any importance. This would be a laborious work, and I do not suggest that Professor Krumbacher should undertake it himself. But it could be easily done in a year or eighteen months, under his guidance, by one of his pupils. The first section in small print under each name would then be 'Handschriften,' and the second 'Ausgaben.' It may seem ungrateful, having got so much, to ask for more, but even in the halls of Olympus one will always find something to wish for.

J. B. Bury.

BRUHN'S *IPHIGENIE AUF TAURIS.*

E. Bruhn's *Iphigenie auf Tauris.* Berlin, Weidmann. M. 2.40.

The Tauric Iphigenia has always attracted its full share of attention among the plays of Euripides. The interest and beauty of the play itself, together with the many questions it suggests, make it an excellent one for the class room, and there are many passages in it that invite and perhaps baffle the skill of the critic. Of special editions there is no lack although they are of very unequal merit, but, to mention some of the more recent, neither Wecklein, Weil, England nor Köchly leaves one satisfied. This new edition by Bruhn finds ample justification in the fact that it is really better calculated than any one of its predecessors to lead one to a good understanding and adequate appreciation of the play.

In general the editor has been conservative in the establishment of the text. In comparing this edition with that of Köchly, of which this is a revision, I have noted some two hundred passages, counting continuous passages as units, in which the text has been changed, and in a large majority of cases there is either a return to the MSS. reading or to something less remote from it. Many needless changes have been done away with: thus we find Ἀχαιοὺς in vs. 13, *παροῦσ' ἀπόντι* in 62, *προσείσας* in 370, *ὄνομα* in 905, *οὐ μηλοθύτας* in 1116, *γᾶς εὐνὰς* in 1267, etc. Often the MSS. reading is kept, even when corrupt, because in Bruhn's opinion no correction that is satisfactory has been proposed. Among these are passages which, as nearly all will agree, still await correction *e.g.* 113, 189 f., 343, 432, 452 f., 633, 782 (which Bruhn is inclined to throw out), 912, 1134, 1150f., 1246 and 1371. Bruhn includes 288, 294, 336, 455, 521, 836, and 914, in regard to all of which he seems to me over-cautious.

Sometimes the traditional text is saved by the assumption of a lacuna, and here

again Bruhn seems to me to go too far. Something has clearly been lost after 1014 and after 1468, but gaps are also indicated after 98, 259, 292, 477, 1349, 1394, 1405, and, in the commentary, 21. At 21 this is needless. At 98 it serves to keep *μάθοιμεν*, but *λάθοιμεν* is surely the right reading (the original reading too, if we may trust Wilamowitz, Analecta p. 32). Without treating that vexed passage in detail, it seems clear to me that two ways of entering the temple are suggested, by climbing the walls or by forcing the doors. Despite critics *πότερα does* lead up to *ἢ* in 99. I accept Kirchhoff's *κλιμάκων* as certain; yet in thus scaling the walls they were sure to be observed, hence *πῶς ἂν λάθοίμεν*. In 100 *ὧν οὐδὲν ἴσμεν* must be corrupt, but *ὧδ'* and *ἔσιμεν* are so patent that emendation is easy. Again at 259 the assumption of a lacuna makes it possible to retain *οὐδέπω*, but surely Seidler's *οἴδ' ἐπεὶ* is preferable and we do not need to transpose with Wecklein. At 292 the lacuna with *ταὐτὰ* for *ταῦτα* gives a new interpretation, but, I think, an incorrect one. *ταὐτὰ* is weak, for we miss a reference to Orestes' hallucination and if we read *χἀ' 'φασκ'* all runs smoothly. The difficulty in *ἠλάσσετο* is not insuperable. In 477 Bruhn is again enabled to keep the traditional text by assuming that some such verse as *ὁπήνιχ' ἥξει χὠπόθεν κἀφ' ὅντινα* has fallen out. This is possible, but it is at least equally likely that *κακόν* is corrupt and Schmidt's *ἄκος* is very close. At 1349 a lacuna of some length is assumed with great probability. No one can read that passage without feeling that something is wrong, and this seems the only remedy: see Bruhn's note on 1345. Again at 1394 the same device makes it possible to keep *νεώς*. I read *σκάφος*, however, without hesitation. The frequent collocation of the words gives a reasonable ground for the intrusion of *νεώς*, and the corruption of the next line, calling for a genitive, may have aided it (Wecklein). Lastly we have a lacuna at 1405, but quite needlessly.

As to rejected verses (printed with smaller type as in Kirchhoff) Bruhn is conservative. He regards nine trimeters as spurious (40 f., 59 f., 720, 957, 1025 f., and 1441 b.), as against twenty-one in England, thirteen each in Wecklein, Dindorf, and Nauck, five in Schöne and four in Kirchhoff. Of 40 f., and 1025 f. I speak below; as to the others, 59 f. are thrown out by nearly every one, 720 may be an interpolation of the familiar type to supply a supposedly missing noun for the *τό* in the preceding verse, and 1441 b. has the warrant of L alone. In the case of 957, however, Bruhn's objection does not seem to me well-grounded. There is no real reason to object to the open statement *οὕνεκ' ἦν μητρὸς φονεύς* after 940: Orestes has told it all in 556. A real conservatism is, however, shown in the retention of 84, 736, 1071, etc.

In the adoption of readings, on the other hand, considerable rashness is shown. Bruhn, as was to be expected, shows a thorough acquaintance with recent Euripidean criticism and adds some conjectures of his own. Of other scholars Wilamowitz is the one oftenest quoted. I give but a few notes:

οὕνεχ' is changed to *εἵνεχ'* in 8 but not in 1388 or 1469; in 295 Wilamowitz's *θανουμένου* is no improvement and leaves *συσταλέντες* ungrounded; in 352 Wecklein is followed in what seems to me a wholly wrong understanding of the passage (see below); in 481 Hirzel's *μακρὰν—χθονὸς* is accepted to the great detriment of the sought-for contrast with the preceding verse, which surely means: 'Long have ye been on your voyage hither'; in 592 Heimsoeth is followed: I prefer Köchly's *χοὺς ἐγὼ θέλω*. In 895 he assumes, with Weil and Badham, mention of a *φύσις κεκραμένη* (Aesch. *Prom.* 116) between *θεοὶ* and *βροτοί*. It is certainly readable and by no means lacks support, but, despite Matthiae, why object to *τί τῶν ἀδοκήτων*? Translate 'Who, be it god or mortal or unlooked for chance?' Has not the desire to connect *πόρον* with *τῶν ἀδοκήτων* as in the 'wretched tail-piece' been the real ground for imagining a difficulty? In 951 Bruhn, after Wilamowitz, reads *σιγῇ δ' ἐτεκτήναντο πρόσφθεγτόν μ'* but that can hardly be what Euripides wrote. On 1134, however, his argument against *πρότονοι* is conclusive.

The commentary is in the main judicious and is characterised by an admirable frankness and sanity. This is marked *e.g.* in 372, where the naturalness of Iphigenia's words is recognised; in 376 in the justification of *πολλά*; in 616 on *προθυμία* as against *προμηθία* (Coleridge, 'Thy good will for him must be something great'!); in 685 in the recognition of the dramatic import of Pylades' climax; in 898 where again we have truth to nature; in 1023 in retaining *οὐκ ἂν δυναίμην*. In all of these passages one can only say that he who interprets them otherwise does not know Euripides or has no feeling for his greatest beauties. On the other hand we miss this sanity of judgment on 52 where Bruhn is rather captious

as to the 'voice'; on 57 as to the import of the dream; on 294 as to the *μυκήματα* of the Erinyes, *et passim*.

In some passages he seems to me wrong. In the note on 33 he says, in objecting to the view that 31–33 are interpolated, 'Denn dann würde Iphigenie den Zweifel, den sie 389 erhebt, überhaupt nicht erheben können, weil sie ja durch die Göttin selbst als Priesterin eingesetzt wäre.' That must mean that he takes *Θόας* as the subject of *τίθησι*, yet on 34 he gives as subject *Ἄρτεμις* and is certainly right. In 67 *ἐστι* is to be supplied, not *ἦ* (the same error in Blaydes on Ar. *Nub.* 493); in 71 he makes *σοι* depend upon *χρεών*, but that is certainly wrong. It is needless to invent instances of *χρή* and its synonyms taking a dative and infinitive, and *συνδοκεῖν* has better warrant if construed *χρεὼν ταῦτα συνδοκεῖν καὶ σοί*. cf. Ar. *Aves* 811. In many points of interpretation one feels inclined to differ. Certainly, despite Wilamowitz, one does not rightly understand Euripides' Iphigenia who speaks of her 'wilde Freude' in 259. That may perhaps do if the words be put in the mouth of the herdsman as in Wecklein's arrangement, but in the light of 221 ff. and 385 ff. we cannot so read Iphigenia's character; even 350 does not warrant it.

Some passages call for a more detailed examination.

34–41. A full discussion of this vexed passage would be out of place here, but I am convinced that, rightly understood, it is (at least from 37 on) sound, and that 40 f. should not be thrown out. Harsh 35 and 36 certainly are; it is only a question as to whether they are unbearably so. To change *τοῖσιν* to a demonstrative simply makes *ἥδεται* a principal verb and that helps but little. Hermann long ago said of these lines, 'Verissima est librorum scriptura nec quidquam habet difficultatis si quis aposiopesin attendat', and he may after all be right. To put in a principal verb in the place of *Ἄρτεμις* makes matters smoother, but why in the world should *θεά* have been glossed? It could have been no one but Artemis, and the two words are not closer together than in 783

> *λέγ' οὔνεκ' ἔλαφον ἀντιδοῦσά μου θεὰ*
> *Ἄρτεμις ἔσωσέ μ'.*

Compare 243

> *θεᾷ φίλον πρόσφαγμα καὶ θυτήριον*
> *Ἀρτέμιδι,*

and again 1435

> *ποῖ ποῖ διωγμὸν τόνδε πορθμεύεις ἄναξ*
> *Θόας;*

Could we accept Mekler's *δρᾶν θέμις ἑορτάς* we could assume *Ἄρτεμις* to have arisen from a corruption, but no one else fancies Euripides wrote that.

After we pass vs. 36 the only difficulty is the asyndeton in 40. Kirchhoff's *θείου* and Kvičala's *θύειν* would remove that, but, aside from other objections, *θύω* was the original reading. The other alternative is to throw out 40 f., with Bruhn and others, as made up to bring the passage in harmony with 621 f. Against this view I offer the following considerations.

Iphigenia says in effect, 'I was made priestess here; the rest I will not tell.' She cannot speak of the horrid rite of human sacrifice save in terms that might anger the goddess. Yet even as she says this she does speak out, impelled by her horror of the situation in which she is placed (cf. 221 ff., 380 ff.), and *θύω* points this impassioned outburst, 'For, you must know, I have to sacrifice.' (For somewhat similar outbursts, where after *σιγῶ* or its equivalent the thing is none the less told, cf. Eur. *Orest.* 14, *Electra* 1245, and one may almost compare Aesch. *Ag.* 36 ff.) She *must* speak out, (how weak is this outburst if *κατάρχομαι* be made the main verb!) but in her deep feeling says too much, and, eager to set herself right, adds these explanatory lines. 'That is to say, I begin the rite—the slaying is done by others.' Harsh the asyndeton may be, but if one can read between the lines, as a dramatic critic must, not intolerably so, and I find a similar instance in Thuc. 4. 10, 3 which I explain in exactly the same way. There Demosthenes, in exhorting his troops to stand firm, says, *τοῦ τε γὰρ χωρίου τὸ δυσέμβατον ἡμέτερον νομίζω—μενόντων μὲν ἡμῶν ξύμμαχον γίγνεται ὑποχωρήσασι δὲ καίπερ χαλεπὸν ὂν εὔπορον ἔσται μηδενὸς κωλύοντος.* 'I maintain that the roughness of the place is in our favour, that is to say, if we hold our ground it is an ally, but men in retreat will find, etc.'

μὲν is found in E and in Dionysius. Editors generally insert *ὃ* from Dionysius before *μενόντων*, but, thus explained, do we need it?

351 ff. *καὶ τοῦτ' ἄρ' ἦν ἀληθές, ἠχθόμην, φίλαι,*
οἱ δυστυχεῖς γὰρ τοῖσιν εὐτυχεστέροις
αὐτοὶ κακῶς πράξαντες οὐ φρονοῦσιν εὖ.

So the MSS. Dindorf corrected ἠχθόμην to ᾐσθόμην, but, with that exception, the passage is kept by Schöne, Köchly, Ziegler [2], Klotz, and Weil [1] (I have not access to Weil [2]). In this case the clause αὐτοί κ.τ.λ. must be felt as causal, or as a re-emphasizing of δυστυχεῖς. This is however mere tautology.

As early as 1813, Seidler suggested that we should read καλῶς, = 'Seeing that they have themselves known prosperity.' The sentiment is then the very common one that it is the change from prosperity to adversity that embitters the heart (cf. 1118 ff.). This change, easy in itself—the MSS. have κακῶν for καλῶν in 378—has found wide acceptance, *e.g.* Badham, Dindorf, Witzschel, Paley and Nauck. Hartung, however, pointed out that we should certainly have some such word as ποτὲ or πάλαι for this sense and, while his αὖθις will not suffice, Dindorf's πάλαι καλῶς is an improvement. Rauchenstein in the Jahrbb. for 1864 and again in 1876 proposed αὐτοί ποτ' εὖ and somewhat similar is Engers' (R. M. 17, 612) αὐτίκα κακῶς, 'Having but recently fallen upon adversity.' For other guesses see Köchly's critical note.

Against this interpretation, which meets the requirement of 351 in being a general maxim, it has been objected that Orestes and Pylades cannot properly be called εὐτυχέστεροι by Iphigenia. She is certainly δυστυχής, and dwells pathetically upon her present lot contrasted with the happy promise of her girlhood; but these men are still more wretched than she, for far from their homes they are to perish miserably by a most horrible fate. This objection is, I think, unanswerable; various attempts have been made to meet it but without success. Mekler (1891) keeps the MSS. text but considers the εὐτυχέστεροι to be, not Orestes and Pylades, but Helen and Menelaus who are mentioned in the verses immediately following. So too Schulze (De Versibus Suspectis et Interpolatis Iph. Taur. Fab. Eur. 1881) who attributes this view to all who retain εὐτυχεστέροις, which he holds to be necessarily corrupt.

This view, *i.e.* that εὐτυχέστεροι refers to Helen and Menelaus I hold to be utterly untenable. 'Who e'er ye be,' says Iphigenia, 'ye shall find me relentless, for—', and the following clause must give the ground for her attitude toward them.

Another alternative is to accept the reading proposed by Wecklein in the Jahrbb. for 1876 and given in his two editions (1876 and 1888):

οἱ δυστυχεῖς γὰρ τοῖσι δυστυχεστέροις
αὐτοὶ κακῶς πράξαντες οὐ φρονοῦσιν εὖ.

This he interprets: 'Die Unglücklichen (wie Iphigenie die im fremden Lande leben muss) meinen es nicht gut mit den noch Unglücklicheren (das sind die Fremden die sterben sollen) wenn sie selber Leid erfahren haben (wie Iphigenie in dem Glauben dass ihr Bruder tot sei).' To this England objects that, while fitting the present situation, it is not sufficiently general to be called a maxim. To me a stronger objection is that it is too involved. Here Bruhn follows Wecklein.

Metzger reads, feeling the same difficulty,

οἱ δυστυχεῖς καὶ τοῖσι δυστυχεστέροις
αὐτοὶ πρὶν εὖ πράξαντες, etc.

and somewhat similar is Weil's

τοῖς δυσπότμοις γὰρ οἵ ποτ' εὐτυχέστεροι.

Others have tried excision, but it seems clear to me that the sense of the whole passage, read in the light of the context, is only satisfied if we read

οἱ δυστυχεῖς γὰρ τοῖσιν εὐτυχεστέροις
ὅ τ α ν κακῶς π ρ ά ξ ω σ ι ν οὐ φρονοῦσιν εὖ.

We have only to assume that some scribe misunderstood the passage and wrote αὐτοὶ over the ὅταν to indicate what he took to be the subject. This could easily have crowded out ὅταν, and then the subjunctive was necessarily changed to the participle. This gives us a general maxim, true and fitting the situation, and absolutely in harmony with Iphigenia's preceding words. It also gives an easy transition to the mention of those εὐτυχέστεροι whom she would most gladly see fall into woe, Helen and Menelaus.

Kirchhoff evidently felt this in proposing αὐτοῖς κακῶς πράξασιν, but that does not satisfy one. The αὐτοῖς and the cumulation of datives are odd. Köchly says of Kirchhoff's text 'Entschieden falsch,' but it is the only reading heretofore proposed that gives the meaning called for. England and Bauer follow Kirchhoff.

1025 f. Iph. ὡς δὴ σκότος λαβόντες ἐκσωθεῖμεν ἄν;
Or. κλεπτῶν γὰρ ἡ νύξ, τῆς δ' ἀληθείας τὸ φῶς.

Bruhn along with most modern editors throws out this couplet. Markland was

first to do so, saying of 1026 'ex Novo Testamento conflatus videtur.' The neuter form σκότος has also been objected to (Dindorf) but, in the light of *Herc. Fur.* 563 and 1159, and Photius' statement that Ameipsias used both forms, without good reason. As to the ὡς ἄν we have but to say that it is not final. The point I wish to emphasize is that those who throw the verses out misinterpret them. Bruhn's note is to me remarkable: 'Wunderlich ist es, dass Iphigenie den Vorschlag erst weiter spezialisirt ehe sie ihn ablehnt; aber ganz thöricht ist das *Pathos* oder der *Sarkasmus*, mit dem Orest selber seinen Vorschlag als *unwürdig* bezeichnet—er, der doch vorher kein Wort gegen den ganz ähnlichen Vorschlag des Pylades einzuwenden hatte,' (the italics are mine,) and others write to the same effect: 'L'argument dont se sert Oreste est plus propre à refuter son opinion qu'à la soutenir' (Weil). Surely the γὰρ in 1026 is the γὰρ of *assent*: 'Aye for night is the time for thieves (and such Phoebus wills that we be) etc.', and Orestes is *not* objecting to the plan. The Taurians use κλέπτοντες in 1359, and in 1400 Iphigenia prays καὶ κλοπαῖς σύγγνωθ' ἐμαῖς.

Misprints in the book are very few, save in matters of accent and breathings, where they are too frequent. I have observed further ἰέναις for ἰέναι in the note on 699. αὐμόρραντον for αἱμ- in the critical note on 225, and pervulgatissimum, as two words, in the note on 649. None are, however, misleading.

AUGUSTUS T. MURRAY.

LELAND STANFORD JR. UNIV. *November* 1896.

GREENIDGE'S GREEK CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY.

A Handbook of Greek Constitutional History, by A. H. J. GREENIDGE. London: Macmillan and Co., 1896. 5*s.* net.

THIS is one of a series of handbooks of archaeology and antiquities, which made a good beginning with Mr. Gardner's well-known work on Greek sculpture. Mr. Greenidge tells us in the preface that he has been anxious to redeem his subject from the charge of dulness; if this has been his object, it cannot be denied that he has succeeded. He can be original even in the treatment of the most familiar themes; the style is fresh and vigorous, and the explanations are, as a rule, clear. The book is, from its nature, mainly intended for beginners, by whom it is likely to be extensively used, but at the same time more advanced students may gather not a few suggestive hints from its pages.

The author's purpose, as stated in the preface, is to sketch the history of Greek public law, and to represent the different types of states in the order of their developement. It was, perhaps, inevitable that one half, and that decidedly the more valuable half of the book, should be occupied with Sparta and Athens; in the author's own words, 'The disproportionate length' at which the constitutions of these two states are treated is 'the result of accident, not of design.' Until accident restores to us some of the missing 157 πολιτεῖαι, this disproportion is not likely to be remedied. At the beginning there are some chapters upon the earlier forms of government, upon colonisation, and upon oligarchy, and the subjects of federal governments and Hellenism are dealt with in the two concluding chapters; the central part of the work is devoted to Sparta and Athens.

In the earlier chapters the sections which treat of colonisation and international law bring together a good deal of information which a beginner cannot easily find elsewhere. The section at the beginning of Chapter IV., on the different forms of government, will do good service, if only by calling attention to the fact, which is commonly obscured in works on Greek constitutional history, that in Greece proper the city-state, in the strict sense of the term, was the exception rather than the rule, even in the fifth century B.C. As Mr. Greenidge puts it 'the πόλις as a *wholly independent* political unit in this portion of Hellas is something of a fiction.' The treatment of oligarchy, on the other hand, is a little disappointing. Surely, it deserves more than thirteen pages; nor is the want of information a sufficient excuse for this disproportionate brevity. More might have been said, which, I think, would have been worth saying. A still more serious objection may

be taken to this part of the book, on the ground of the author's view that oligarchy was a transitional form of government, and 'one which could seldom stand alone unaided by some foreign power.' The instances of oligarchial governments which are adduced by Mr. Greenidge himself go far to prove that during the greater part of the two centuries which he is chiefly considering, the fifth and the fourth, oligarchy, rather than democracy, was the prevalent form of government in Greece proper. It is significant that the 'persistence of oligarchic government' in states so typical as Corinth, Megara, and Sicyon should be pronounced 'astonishing.' This persistence is not to be explained simply by the support given by Sparta. In northern Greece there were oligarchies which were wholly independent of any support from without, and across the Aegean instances, such as Mitylene and Samos, prove that the rule of the few might endure, not only without the aid of external influences, but even in spite of them. Nor is the case quite so clear in the states south of the Isthmus as is here assumed. In the author's view, the strength of oligarchy in this region finds a sufficient explanation in the influence of the Peloponnesian League. Does not this position involve something like a *ὕστερον πρότερον*? Might it not be maintained with equal plausibility that the permanence of the League finds its explanation in the strength of oligarchic sentiment in the states which composed it? If Mr. Greenidge's view is correct, oligarchy should have disappeared from the Peloponnese after the battle of Leuctra; as a matter of fact, within ten years of Leuctra, at the date of the battle of Mantinea, states so important as Elis, Corinth, and Achaia were still under oligarchic rule. The cases of Corinth and Achaia are instructive. At Corinth, where, after a brief spell of democracy, the restoration of oligarchy had been effected by Spartan influence in 387, the anti-popular party maintained itself in office long after Sparta had lost the power to coerce. The case of Achaia is even stronger. Here the democracy, which had been established by Thebes, was overthrown almost as soon as it was set up. It would appear then that there might be states, south of the Isthmus, and in the fourth century, in which *democracy* could only maintain its position when 'supported by the influence of a foreign power.'

In the treatment of the Spartan state the most noticeable feature is the prominence which is given to the account of the actual working of the constitution. This is at once the most difficult, and the most interesting side of Spartan constitutional history, and Mr. Greenidge is to be congratulated upon the success which he has attained. The pages in which he describes the prerogatives of the kings, or discusses the relations of the ephorate to the gerousia, present a striking contrast to the treatment of such questions in the ordinary handbooks; they are eminently readable, and will help to correct one-sided views as to the part played both by the kings and the ephors in Spartan history.

Of the ninety pages which are allotted to the account of Athens half are occupied with the history of the constitutional changes, and the remainder is divided about equally between the working of the constitution, and the organisation of the empire and the confederacy. In the historical sections the estimate of Clisthenes' legislation is at once original and just, and the apology for sortition is written with some vigour. Is there, however, 'abundant evidence' that Attica in early times possessed a very mixed population? It is not, at any rate, to be discovered in the facts brought forward in these pages. The account of the working of the constitution is in some respects excellent, and will suggest new ideas to a good many readers. It is a pity, however, that the real value of this part of the handbook should be impaired by more than one lapse into the attractive fallacy of reading the present into the past. It is, of course, easy to produce a vivid impression upon the beginner's mind by calling Eubulus and Lycurgus Chancellors of the Exchequer, or by describing them as 'the great Chancellors of the century' (it is new to one, by the bye, that 'Chancellor' can stand for Chancellor of the Exchequer) but it is at the cost of suggesting a good deal more error than truth. When again the beginner is told that Cleon and Agyrrhius were 'financial geniuses of a very high order,' is he not likely to carry away a somewhat false idea as to the comparative complexity of ancient and modern finance? Perhaps, however, one should be grateful to Mr. Greenidge for sparing us Beloch's verdict in all its native exaggeration. Most of all does one regret the intrusion of the 'Prime Minister' into the constitution of Athens in the person of the hypothetical president of the board of Strategi. No new arguments are brought forward in favour either of the hypothesis of a president, or of the analogy with a Prime Minister. It is true that both

the hypothesis and the analogy are more or less explained away, but the ordinary reader, I fear, is more likely to remember the suggestion that there was a Prime Minister at Athens than the qualifications by which that suggestion is rendered comparatively harmless.

With regard to the handbook as a whole, two criticisms suggest themselves. In the first place, in the desire to harmonise his authorities, Mr. Greenidge runs the risk of misleading his readers as to what those authorities state and what they do not state. On page 141, *e.g.*, it is stated that in 479 a decree of the people, introduced by Aristides, changed the land census into a census of all property; a statement which is repeated twice over later on. True, in a note it is explained that this statement is based upon a hypothesis, but it is a serious matter, in a work intended for beginners, to put hypotheses and facts on a level in the text. The justification for this addition to the facts of Athenian constitutional history is, according to Mr. Greenidge, that it is the only mode of reconciling Plutarch and the *Athenaiôn Politeia*. If this were so, it would hardly be a conclusive reason for accepting the hypothesis; I imagine, however, that few will be ready to admit that Plutarch and the *Politeia* can be reconciled by this method. Plutarch says that a decree was passed by Aristides in 479, and that its effect was to open the archonship to *all* Athenians (*κοινὴν εἶναι τὴν πολιτείαν καὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας ἐξ Ἀθηναίων πάντων αἱρεῖσθαι*); the *Politeia*, on the other hand, knows of no decree in 479, and asserts that the archonship was not thrown open until 457, and that even then the Thetes were still excluded. The hypothesis in question, so far from proving both statements to be true, would prove both authorities to be wrong; the *Politeia*, because it ignores the decree of Aristides, and Plutarch, because he completely misconceives its purport. Or again, to take two other passages which directly bear upon this question. In the *Politics* (page 1304 A) there is the well-known statement that the services rendered by the Areopagus in the Persian wars brought about a conservative reaction, which was in its turn followed by a fresh developement of the democracy, in consequence of the victory of Salamis. In the *Politeia* it is stated that the reputation gained by the Areopagus in its conduct of the war won for it seventeen years of supremacy, which lasted till the reform of Ephialtes in 462. Mr. Greenidge regards the relation between these two passages as that of a summary account to a more detailed narrative. I find it difficult to follow him in this view. Do not the two passages imply two different and wholly inconsistent traditions? Both accounts, of course, agree in recognising an accession of influence to the Areopagus, followed by a fresh developement of the democracy; the difficulty is to determine what event in the history of the Athenian constitution is referred to in the words *τὴν δημοκρατίαν ἰσχυροτέραν ἐποίησεν*, in the passage in the *Politics*. Is it the law of Ephialtes, or is it the decree of Aristides? Clearly, it cannot be both; either the decree of Aristides is ignored by the *Politics*, as it is by the *Politeia*, or else the reference in the *Politics* is to the decree of 479, and not to the reform of 462. I have never felt any hesitation in deciding for the latter alternative. A constitutional change in a democratic direction, which is the direct result of the victory of the *ναυτικὸς ὄχλος* at Salamis, is in complete agreement with Plutarch's account of the matter; it is not easy to see how it can be explained by the success of Ephialtes in 462, or be harmonised with the theory of a conservative reaction, the force of which was not spent for seventeen years. In any case, if Mr. Greenidge is right in his view of the relation of the two passages, he cannot be right in the comparison which he draws between the democratic movement at Syracuse and the democratic movement at Athens. There is no parallel between the victory in the Great Harbour and the victory of Salamis, if in the one case Salamis was followed by seventeen years of an anti-democratic régime, and in the other a democratic revolution was the immediate consequent of the defeat of the Athenians. It need hardly be pointed out that, if the passage in the *Politics* be interpreted as a reference to the decree of Aristides (Plutarch's decree, not Mr. Greenidge's version of it), the parallel between Athens and Syracuse could hardly be closer. I will only point to one more instance of this tendency. On page 141 it is stated, in accordance with the *Politeia*, that the lot was not reinstituted for the appointment of archons until the year 487, yet, on the very page before, Herod. vi. 109 is referred to as proving the existence of the lot at Athens 'before the constitution could be described as democratic.' I am not quite sure what is the precise meaning to be attached to these last words, but that is immaterial. If the account in the *Politeia*, viz. that down to 487 the archons were *αἱρετοὶ*, not *κληρωτοὶ*, is

accepted, the polemarch at the battle of Marathon cannot have been κληρωτὸς, so that the words in Herodotus, ὁ τῷ κυάμῳ λαχὼν πολεμαρχέειν, can prove nothing as to the antiquity of sortition; all that they can prove is the inaccuracy of Herodotus.

The second criticism relates to the treatment of the fourth century. I am aware that in one of our Universities the belief is widely entertained that Greek history ends with the archonship of Euclides; it may seem therefore unreasonably exacting to demand that the fourth century should be put on a level with the fifth. I cannot, however, but regret to find, not only that, as it appears to me, the true importance of this century from a constitutional point of view is not brought out, but that there are passages which seem to suggest that its history has not inspired the author with the same interest, and that it has not been dealt with with the same care, as are displayed elsewhere in the handbook. More might have been said about both the tyrannis and the Areopagus during this period, and so much is left unsaid at the beginning of the account of the Athenian Confederacy as to leave a misleading impression. In a second edition something should certainly be added to the account of the Olynthian league. A sketch of the league's history which ends with the statement that 'the league begun in 382 was dissolved in 379, and the path to Greece lay open to the Macedonian kings,' is likely to lead those readers very far astray indeed who possess no further knowledge of the fortunes of this confederacy. What, finally, one may fairly ask, would be thought, in the case of the fifth century, of the statement that the battle of the Eurymedon was fought in its concluding years? Yet, when it is only the fourth century that is in question, an event which belongs to the year 370, the σκυταλισμὸς at Argos, can be described as happening 'at its close.'

E. M. Walker.

McCOSH'S EDITION OF THE *BACCHIDES*.

Plauti Bacchides. Edited with Introduction, Commentary, and Critical Notes, by J. McCosh, M.A. London: Methuen and Co., 1896. 12*s.* 6*d.*

An English edition of a play of Plautus not previously edited is something to be received with thankfulness, and this the first English edition of the *Bacchides* comes with all the advantages of clear type, good paper and wide margins. The editor states in his preface that 'where neither MSS. readings nor emendations of former editors can be admitted, owing to defect in sense or metre, one (*i.e.* presumably an emendation) has been proposed.' But the typography does not show where conjectures have been introduced into the text, nor does the Apparatus Criticus, in which Latin and English are sometimes curiously mixed. The editor states quite truly that 'it is difficult to refer students to a single, and at the same time a good, text for all the Comedies.' This difficulty has been removed now that we have Leo's new edition, not to speak of the complete Goetz and Schoell text in the Teubner series. But even when the editor was at work it was unnecessary to refer to so many editions as he has done—often two for a single play. This makes his references almost useless.

The edition has been prepared for no special class of students—'but the editor will be pleased if it is found useful to students who may have to read Plautus for an examination. It is believed that no point which a student of this poet ought to know has been passed over in the Introduction and the Notes.' The Introduction is long enough, but it contains non-essentials and omits essentials. There is nothing about Roman Comedy or the Roman Stage, no discussion of Plautus' treatment of his originals, no attempt to collect what is known about the original of this play and no sketch of the plot. There is an adequate life of Plautus, though the editor gives his name as '*Marcus Accius Plautus* or *Titus Maccius Plautus*' and states his own preference for the former without any reference to Buecheler or other recent discussion of the subject. Some of the sections might be dispensed with, *e.g.* pp. viii.–xix. are mainly filled with the opinions of Pareus and others about the poet and with an attack on Horace, whose standpoint is not quite appreciated. Then comes an account of the MSS. and a list of editions. The sections on Metres and Prosody and Accent follow. The scansion is fully discussed, a long list of lines is given and the editor explains how he would scan them. There are plenty of instances and

plenty of statistics; the question is how far any principle would be made clear to a reader, and Mr. McCosh is perhaps at more pains to show the shortcomings of previous Plautinists, notably Bentley, than to state the facts concisely and perspicuously for beginners.

The notes are copious and contain a great deal of information that is good and useful, but there are observations that are inaccurate, others that are misleading, and some that seem to be unnecessary. For instance, on the opening words *converrite scopis* there are notes on the simple verb *verrere*, on the compound *converrere* and on *scopis* which ought to be unnecessary to any one who is able to read Plautus. As inaccurate or misleading take the notes on *ecquis* p. 83, '*ecquis, enquis* with *n* assimilated, a more emphatic form of the interrogative; "is there any one to call?" "will some one call?"'; on *equidem* pp. 95–96, 'the *e* is evidently an abbreviation of *en* or *em* in Latin from which we get also *ecce*, the Greek ἦν, a particle of exclamation employed in calling attention' etc. Mr. McCosh admits that *equidem* is used with other persons than the first, but thinks that 'originally the particle was joined with the pers. pronoun of the first pers., which following the tendency of the classical languages was very often omitted, and that its application to other persons and numbers was gradually extended.' He does not mention *quando equidem, atque equidem* and so forth. Again on p. 97, '*quid ais*? "what have you to say?" This phrase either draws attention to a new point in the discourse or recalls the hearer to something which has been overlooked, the note disguises rather than explains the real use of the idiom. On *amabo* = 'please' p. 91 and *qui* = 'how' p. 92 a tremendous list of references is given, some by lines, some by act and scene. No one believes more thoroughly than I do in references where a word or phrase can be elucidated thereby. But to give more than seventy references for *amabo* is to sow not with the hand but with the whole sack. It would surely have been enough to give three or four *in extenso* and then state, if the number is wanted, how many times Plautus uses the word! On p. 114 there is a long note on *nummus*. 'It will be observed that *nummus* is the general term for a coin in Latin and that coined money was generally computed in *drachmae* at Athens. Therefore the coin mentioned here was a gold piece the weight of two *drachmae*.' That *nummus* without an adjective where a definite coin is meant is the *didrachmon* is quite true, but Mr. McCosh does not quote the decisive passages and I am unable to follow the reasoning of the note as it stands. Such a note as that on *quid istic*? p. 200 does not explain the use of the idiom. There are misprints that need correction as Gaetz for Goetz twice in the preface, ἕζω p. 83.

Mr. McCosh has many qualifications for his task. He has a genuine enthusiasm for his author and he has been unsparing of pains in the preparation of his edition. But while we may be thankful to him for what he has done, the book will need thorough revision and some excision before it can be pronounced to be a really good and satisfactory edition of the *Bacchides*.

J. H. Gray.

Queen's College, Cambridge.

AN ITALIAN EDITION OF THE *ILIAD* AND *ODYSSEY*.

L'Iliade commentata da C. O. Zuretti, Libro Primo, 1896 (*pp.* xxvii. 113; L. 1, 80), and

L'Odissea commentata da C. O. Zuretti, Libro Primo, 1897 (*pp.* viii. 100; L. 1, 20).

Both in the *Collezione di Classici Greci e Latini con Note Italiane* published by Ermanno Loescher at Turin.

Of these two editions *Iliad* i. is intended for students whose knowledge of Greek is small, while by his edition of *Odyssey* i. the editor hopes to meet the needs of more advanced readers, and at the same time to hasten the improvement in Greek studies in Italy, which he anticipates at no distant future. We wish him all success. He has paid great attention to etymology, and has acquainted himself with the results of Fick, Prellwitz and other 'Sprachforscher.' At the same time French scholarship has not been overlooked. The result is a polyglot edition of *Od.* i.; but the editor considers that French is intelligible to his readers, and wishes to inspire some of them with a desire to learn German: a daring experiment, for which no success could be expected in an English edition.

In the belief that the destructive criti-

cism of Vico, Wolf etc. has caused us to neglect unduly the ancient notions of Homer (È più nota, direi, la reazione che l'azione) he has prefixed to the *Iliad* two Greek lives of Homer, viz. that attributed to Herodotus, and one contained in a codex of the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele at Rome. He would compare these with the legendary lives of the saints. But surely these lives of Homer are the very antithesis of, let us say, the Little Flowers of St. Francis, inasmuch as of popular legend they contain nothing, certainly next to nothing, but are vain fictions of grammarians. Nevertheless Zuretti has done well to make these lives better known, for their influence may be traced in classical literature. For instance, though the commentators on Plato seem not to have noticed the resemblance, the passage *Rep.* 398 A about refusing admittance to the imitative poet and sending him away anointed with myrrh, etc., its interpretation by the ancients as a reference to Homer, and the remarks of Dio Chrysostom and Aristides, that such was the honour paid to swallows, seem to find their explanation in such an account of the wanderings of Homer as is given in the life by 'Herodotus,' and more particularly in the fragment of the Εἰρεσιώνη = *Epigram* xv. Plato means, 'we will treat him with all respect and send him ἐρίῳ στέψαντες to sing his εἰρεσιώνη, *i.e.* to beg, in another city.' The line

νεῦμαί τοι, νεῦμαι ἐνιαύσιος, ὥς τε χελιδὼν

shows that Dio and Aristides did not speak without book when they said that Plato meant to give Homer χελιδόνος τιμήν..

The type and paper of these editions is good, but misprints are far too common, and the line 'Virum mihi Camoena' etc. should surely not be assigned to Ennius. As the editor has paid so much attention to etymology, he may be glad to have brought before his notice (if he is not by now acquainted with it) Prellwitz' excellent derivation of ἐνιαυτός in the *Festschrift für Ludwig Friedlaender*, 1895. According to him ἐνιαυτός is properly the 'Jahrestag,' the day when the year (ἔτος) has come round to its starting point, and the world is once more ἐνὶ αὐτῷ. τελεσφόρον εἰς ἐνιαυτόν (δ 86) = 'till the day which completes the old year, and begins the new.'

C. M. Mulvany.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

THE COLUMN OF AURELIUS.

Die Marcussäule. Eug. Petersen, A. von Domaszewski, und G. Calderini. Mit cxxviii Tafeln. München, Bruckmann. 1896. M. 300.

The last year has seen the publication of important works on three of the most important sculptured records of the Roman wars against the tribes of the North, the Column of Trajan, the Column of Aurelius, and the monument of Adamklissi. The reliefs of Adamklissi are published for the first time by Mr. Tocilesco with the help of Prof. Benndorf. The Column of Trajan had been adequately published in photographic plates by M. Froehner, but is now appearing in cheaper form under the editorship of Dr. C. Cichorius, with a subvention from the Saxon Government. The Column of Aurelius had hitherto been figured only in the very unsatisfactory engravings of Bartoli. Owing to financial assistance from the German Emperor, it has now been carefully surveyed and photographed; and casts of the more important scenes have been taken.

Of the way in which the plates of Dr. Petersen's work are executed it would not be easy to speak too highly. They are admirable. As the relief of the figures is very high, they need to be seen from various points; and this is provided for by a system of overlapping plates, so that most of the figures are repeated. The text includes an introduction and a description of the plates by E. Petersen, a discussion of their testimony by A. v. Domaszewski, an architectural chapter by G. Calderini, and a historical chapter by Th. Mommsen. It is unfortunate that the price of the work places it out of the reach of many; and yet is it to our credit that English institutions and individuals cannot afford to buy copies of books on the production of which the less wealthy Germans spend immense sums?

Compared with the noble Column of Trajan, that of Aurelius is in all ways inferior. Its material is poorer, Italian for

Parian marble; and this together with the height of its relief has caused its bad condition of surface. It has suffered greatly from injuries, repairs, and extensive restorations, one may rather call them botchings, of the most repulsive character. In design it imitates the Column of Trajan in many parts, and is always clumsy and jejune. And yet in some respects it is of unsurpassable interest: the antagonists have so great a claim on the modern world. On one side the great Emperor and his legions; on the other the German tribes who went by the names of the Suevi, Quadi, and Marcomanni, cousins of the Franks and the Saxons.

Prof. Mommsen observes that the written history of the wars of Marcus is so defective that we must go to the column for facts and read its scenes by their own light. The task is one which requires severe archaeological training. And hitherto, strangely enough, the sculptured records of the wars of our Teutonic ancestors have been inadequately studied by us. We have been content to call the adversaries of the Romans barbarians, not deciding accurately whether they are Celts or Germans, Dacians or Getae or Sarmatians. Prof. Furtwängler, in a vigorous though not convincing paper already noticed in these pages (*Intermezzi*; *C. R.* 1896, p. 446) has attempted to distinguish various barbarian types, and has herein done a service to science.

The interest of the Column of Aurelius lies partly in its depiction of Roman warfare, but more especially in its representation of German towns and German people. The impression which it gives us of the Suevi, Quadi, and Marcomanni is very favourable. It is evident that the war was a slow and indecisive one; and it seems to have ended rather in an agreement than a conquest. Germans serve as the bodyguard of Aurelius himself (Pl. 69); they often appear as the allies, as well as the enemies of the Romans (Pl. 115, etc.). The noble type of the German chiefs, with their long beards and dignified carriage, is unmistakable. They know how to be beheaded without losing courage. Even their women when captured do not give way, nor exhibit the dulness of the Sarmatian women, but maintain a certain dignity. In the scenes the contrasted types of German, Celt, Sarmatian and Scyth are preserved. The Sarmatians are demonstrative and vivacious, with unkempt hair, and low foreheads. Their physical type, resembling that of the Russian peasant, indicates their Slavonic race. The Celts (Pl. 77) are identified by the torques: they have prominent nose and chin, wide mouth and wrinkled forehead, a type notably less noble than the German. It is interesting to notice that in the cold forests of the north German ordinary men wore no more clothing than a pair of breeches, and a short cloak fastened on the shoulder. The chiefs were more warmly clad: and the devotion of the people to them seems to have impressed the Romans: in several cases the clansmen are represented on the column as throwing away their lives, in order to allow their leaders to escape.

The parallelism of the scenes of the Column of Aurelius to those of the Trajan Column diminishes the value of the former as a historic document. In both a great figure of Victory appears on the front, half way up. On the Trajan column, it divides the first from the second Dacian war. It may be doubted whether Dr. v. Domaszewski is right in supposing that on the Aurelius Column it divides the Marcomannic from the Sarmatian war, since the Sarmatians come in before we reach the Victory.

The most generally interesting scenes of the Column are those which depict the intervention of the gods on behalf of the Romans. In the legendary early history of Christianity that intervention plays a large part, and it is generally supposed that the Column lends countenance to those traditions. But an impartial consideration of the reliefs shows that this is scarcely the case. In one scene (Pl. 17), where a Roman fortification is undergoing a siege, the wooden constructions of the besiegers are overthrown and burned by a thunderbolt. In another scene, belonging to a later stage of the war (Pl. 21 and foll.) we see the Rain-god with wide dripping wings spread above Romans and Quadi. To the Romans he brings relief: men and horses drink eagerly, having clearly suffered from drought. At the same time the inundation of water sweeps away men and beasts on the side of the Germans. The Romans are depicted as journeying through a mountainous country when they are refreshed by the rain; but some fighting is going on in the lower part of the relief, and it even looks as if the Quadi were being driven into the stream by the legions. Dr. v. Domaszewski observes that this is in close accord with the statements of Dion; this, however, is not altogether the case. Dion, according to his epitomizer, narrated (71, 8) how the legions were hemmed in by the Quadi, cut off from water, and reduced to great straits, when by divine intervention an extraordinary storm broke, bringing

abundant rain to the Romans, but overwhelming their enemies with lightning. The credit of the intervention was given by Dion to Arnuphis, an Egyptian priest; but it was claimed by the Christians for the prayers of their co-religionists in the army. It is clear that on the Column nothing is recorded but ordinary heavy rain; but Dion sets rolling the snowball of miraculous narrative which soon attains great proportions. Dion, as is known, had a great liking for portents and miracles.

I have not criticized the execution of the volumes before us, for the simple reason that there is no opportunity for criticism. The plates are, as I have already observed, admirable. The text is brief, clear, and very satisfactory. It is greatly to be hoped that the proper publication of the sculptured memorials of the Roman wars will induce well equipped scholars to move further on the lines initiated by Petersen, Benndorf, and Furtwängler, and bring to the aid of history and ethnography the results of their careful observations of Roman sculpture. As Dr. Petersen points out, while the art of the Column of Trajan is like its material Greek, the art of the later column is Roman. And Roman work, being less under the dominion of style than that of the Greeks, is more to be trusted in matters of fact. It is possible too that our records of German wars may go back further than we think. As Prof. Furtwängler shows, the Bastarnae were at first regarded by the Greeks as a Gaulish tribe, and Polybius accepts them as such; but Pliny and Tacitus know that they were German. Is it not then highly probable that some of the tribes which overran Macedonia in the third century B.C., and gave rise to the Pergamene school of art, were also not Gaulish but Teutonic? There is evidently here an opening for further investigation.

Meantime there is a great need, especially in England, for bringing these sculptured records into connexion with the teaching of Roman history. In interest they are second only to the Bayeux tapestry, and in art incomparably superior to that work. The photographs of the column of Trajan, at all events, are now placed within the reach of schoolmasters and college lecturers. It is a pity that the cast of that column which exists in the South Kensington Museum is so placed that it is impossible to see more than a small part of it. Both of the columns are of more historical and scientific value than the far more beautiful productions of the best Greek art; and the liberality of the German governments has laid them open for general use.

PERCY GARDNER.

GARDNER ON GREEK SCULPTURE.

A Handbook of Greek Sculpture. By E. A. GARDNER. Part II., (Macmillan's Handbooks of Archaeology and Antiquities). 5*s.*

THE good qualities which were conspicuous in the first part of Prof. Gardner's Handbook are as characteristic of the second, and it is not too much to say that the whole book easily takes rank before all other English elementary treatises on Greek sculpture. This part covers the history of the subject from the decorative sculptures of the Parthenon to Graeco-Roman and Roman times.

The literature relating to the Parthenon is so large that an attempt to give an account of the metopes, pediments, and frieze in less than thirty pages must suffer from compression and omission. Thus of the 'Victory,' which now stands with the sculptures of the East pediment, we are not told that there are strong reasons for supposing that it does not belong to the East pediment at all. There is some excuse for the fact that Furtwängler's theory of the interpretation of the angle figures of the West pediment is passed over in silence, although Collignon has adopted it. On the whole, Prof. Gardner is most cautiously conservative in his interpretations; but he sometimes carries his caution a little too far, as when he says of the male figure still *in situ* in the West pediment, which has been supposed to be either Cecrops or Asclepius, that 'neither theory is as yet convincingly proved.' It would have been less disheartening to the beginner had he been told to regard it as one of the two. For the central group of the East frieze, Prof. Gardner adopts, as 'perhaps more probable' than other solutions, the suggestion that the priest is folding up and putting away the old peplos of Athena to make place for the new one which was to be brought her. This explanation certainly does not solve all difficulties, but it is at least better than the 'carpet' theory, which Prof. Gardner judiciously ignores. I have elsewhere dealt with this point (*Class. Rev.* 1894 p. 225), but I may be allowed to repeat that as the procession has not yet arrived at the place where the central figures are standing, the garment

in question cannot be the new peplos; not to mention the fact that it is being folded up instead of unfolded.[1] The choice lies between the old peplos and the priest's himation or some other piece of cloth. To the objection that the new peplos, on this theory, would not be represented anywhere on the frieze, it may be replied that neither is the statue of the goddess herself represented. For decorative purposes, the representation of the procession was the main object; the rest could be done by mere suggestion.

To pass to another monument, we are told that the Nereid tomb falls 'in all probability' within the limits of the fifth century. Nevertheless it is admitted in a note that it may yet be connected with the Lycian prince Perikles. Now, if coins prove anything, then those issued by Perikles prove that his reign belongs to the fourth century; so that the association is a difficult matter.

But is the tomb really of the fifth century? Are not the figures of the Nereids, for instance, just such as a provincial artist would have produced, working in the fourth century from models of an earlier period? Whatever the truth may be, it is worth while remembering that there is no imperative necessity to connect the tomb with Perikles. The association was probably first suggested by the fact that Perikles is the only Lycian prince—after Kubernis—whose name has come down to us in literature. But we know from the Lycian coinage that there were other princes reigning in Lycia towards the close of the fifth century, by one of whom the Nereid monument may well have been erected.

With Prof. Gardner's placing of the various monuments, as regards their artistic value, it is usually difficult to disagree. One statement, however, is somewhat unfortunate. We are told that in the Mausoleum reliefs 'the wonderful variety prevents any hint of repetition, even in detail.' In view of the well-known slab from Genoa, where the parallelism of lines suggests a problem in Euclid, this praise is astonishing.

It is unwise to speak of the Sidon sarcophagi without having seen the originals; but of one point it is possible to judge from reproductions, and certainly the faults of composition in which the reliefs abound would seem to show that the praise bestowed upon them is not very well deserved.

The book contains very few minor errors. The terra-cotta statuette of the Diadumenos mentioned on p. 349, note 2, is not, we believe, in the British Museum. Ἀνθρωπόποιος and ἀνδριαντόποιος are oddly accentuated. But there are few books of the kind which can be so freely recommended as Prof. Gardner's.

G. F. Hill.

[1] It has indeed been suggested by Collignon that the garment is being folded in order that it may be carried into the temple. This solves the latter, but not the former of the difficulties mentioned.

MEMPHIS AND MYCENAE.

In his note, *supra*, pp. 128 ff., Mr. Myres has alluded to the fact that he sent me a proof of his review, and that I sent him a memorandum in reply. In sending me the proof, he stated that his object was to avoid controversy as far as possible, 'at all events on matters of fact'; and I devoted the greater part of my memorandum to what I conceived to be matters of fact. But he made hardly any alteration in the proof.

For example, there is his assertion that certain dates 'will not work out on any hypothesis but that of a year of 365 days.' It is simply a matter of arithmetic that they will not work out on that hypothesis: see above, pp. 79, 80. Or again there are his remarks about the coffin of Pinetchem's grandson. In these he represents the book as saying exactly the reverse of what it does say: see above, pp. 76, 77. I called his attention to both these points, but he made no alteration.

In one instance he attempts to justify his statements. On pp. 452, 453 of his review he asserted that my chronology was founded on 'a continuous genealogy' of 'fifteen generations'; adding that 'six of them are in the female line,' and that 'fully half of the children in this list were not eldest sons,' and also discussing 'the birth-to-birth average of parental ages.' He published these assertions in spite of what I told him in my memorandum. And now he says in his note, p. 129:—'When a writer fills page after page with statements that A, father of B, married C, daughter of D, and so forth, a reviewer may be pardoned if he thinks that a genealogy is intended.' But this is not to the point. It is not a question of 'a genealogy' at large, but of a definite genealogy of fifteen generations of which he gave particulars; and this genealogy is not to be extracted from the statements in the book.

He also writes as follows, p. 129:—'On the origin of Queen Thii, my criticism was that Mr. Torr had committed either a logical

fallacy or a grammatical confusion. His retort is to print my sentence halved, and adorned with italics of his own.' In his review, p. 450, he gave his version of my statement, adding 'But, in syllogistic form, "some foreigners are not Greeks."' In my reply, p. 78, I gave my own version of my statement, adding 'Mr. Myres' comment is :—"But, in syllogistic form, *some foreigners are not Greeks.*"' The reader will perceive that I did not print the sentence halved, as Mr. Myres asserts; and that, where I employed italics, Mr. Myres had himself employed inverted commas.

I told him in my memorandum that I had never suggested that Queen Thii was a Greek, and called his attention very pointedly to what I had said about her origin. But the only alteration that he made, was to qualify the words 'He [Mr. Torr] also thinks' with a foot-note :— 'Unless "this region" and "that region" in the same sentence refer to the same country; which would be very queer English.' I believe that it is perfectly good English to change from 'this' to 'that' on passing from the first clause to the second in a sentence of that form. But even if this sentence were ambiguous, when taken by itself, the context would remove all doubt.

It is surely a very strong measure for a reviewer to attack an author for holding certain views, when he has got a memorandum from the author telling him that those are not the author's views. But this is what Mr. Myres has done in that review of his; and not merely in two or three places, but in many. And that, I think, is a question that concerns the management of this journal. For if this were a matter that could be taken seriously, and the *Classical Review* were going to be sued for a libel, there would be a difficulty in setting up the defendants' plea of 'fair comment.'

There are some other points in Mr. Myres' note which call for a reply.

On the Crete question he says :—'Mr. Torr ingeniously rearranges his quotation.' In quoting two consecutive paragraphs I let the quotation run straight on, instead of starting the second paragraph in a fresh line. There was no other rearrangement. Then he says that I have omitted some words in another quotation. The omission was indicated by the usual dots. And then he says that my 'statement that Mr. Evans' book has no appendix is a verbal quibble.' His citation was, 'Evans, *Cretan Pictographs*, 1895, Appendix; cf. p. 57.' And the book has no Appendix. If he chooses to call the final chapter an Appendix, when it is not called so in the book itself, he ought not to grumble at being misunderstood.

On the Tell el-Amarna question he says that, in setting out the evidence, I have omitted a vital fact. What he calls a 'fact,' is really a couple of assertions, α that the Ægean potsherds were intermingled with Egyptian potsherds 'in such a way that subsequent admixture is out of the question,' and β that the Egyptian potsherds are of the XVIIIth Dynasty. As I have said before, I believe that both these assertions are without foundation.

On the Kahun question he speaks of misquotation and misrepresentation. In his review, p. 448, he said that Mr. Petrie 'distinctly states (*Illahun*, p. 10) that they [the potsherds] are neither Naukratite nor of any later style known to him.' I naturally supposed that he was referring to the passage on p. 10 where Mr. Petrie speaks of the Naukratite pottery as 'well known to us,' and then refers to 'any later period.' Of course I quite accept his statement that he was referring to another passage. But I must confess that I am puzzled; for in this other passage Mr. Petrie speaks only of 'historic pottery,' and does not mention Naukratite at all.

On the Vaphio question he says :—'A more candid critic would have added that the whole tenor of the *Times* article is to attribute the Mykenæan necropolis at Kurion to a date below 700: and that 700 is the highest date specifically mentioned.' He cited the *Times* on the Vaphio question, and I showed what it really said about that question. If he had cited it on the Kurion question, I would have mentioned what it said of that; but he did not cite it for anything except the Vaphio question.

I cannot help thinking that these imputations of want of candour, and so forth, ought not to have been made upon such very slender grounds.

CECIL TORR.

[Surely the difference is one of opinion on questions of archaeology, regarding which some day, perhaps, 'securus iudicabit orbis.' Mr. Torr's Memorandum was carefully considered, and it still seems to me that the remarks of the Reviewer do not put statements into Mr. Torr's mouth which he repudiated, but deny in certain cases the correctness or the relevancy of his argument.

T

However, the matter has been stated sufficiently for readers to form their own opinion.

As regards the last paragraph of Mr. Torr's Note, I am sure that no intentional want of candour was imputed, and I regret that any words used should seem to bear that meaning.—Ed.]

MONTHLY RECORD.

ITALY.

S. Pietro Montagnon (*Venetia.*)—An interesting tombstone has been found, with an axe, a plummet, a trumpet, and a flute engraved on the tympanum. The inscription runs: Q · APPEVS · AVCV | RINVS · Q · APPEO | EVTYCHIANO · PA | TRI · OPTIMO ET · CE | SERNIA . NICEFO | RIS MARITO DVꟻ | CISSIMO · CAꟻ A- MAV | ꟻ AE · APONESI | V V F.

The word καλαμαύλης for a piper occurs in Athenaeus (176 D).

Aponesi refers to the town of Aquae Aponi.[1]

Bologna.—In April 1896 a pavement was discovered in the garden of the Palazzo Albergati, which stands on the supposed site of the Thermae of Augustus. The pavement is of black and white mosaic with decorative patterns, apparently of late date. There are no traces of adjoining walls or buildings, and everything points to its belonging not to a public edifice but to a private house. Hence the view that this is the site of the Thermae is probably wrong, and they must be sought for on the site where the pavements were discovered, mentioned in the Monthly Record for May 1893 (*C. R.* vii. p. 229).[2]

Pitigliano, Etruria.—The site of an Etruscan *pagus* with its cemetery has come to light. The tombs are of two types, known as *a cassone* and *a camera*; one is very elaborate, with a vestibule and three large chambers, one of which contains four large sarcophagi. Among the contents of tombs were several varieties of pottery, including common black-glazed vases; red-glazed vases, one with geometrical patterns and rude figures of horses; an amphora of Rhodian type with two friezes of running panthers divided by a lotos-pattern; Proto-Corinthian lekythi; and ordinary bucchero ware.[2]

Tortoreto (*Picenum*).—A hoard of coins has been found here, consisting of: cast coins: six unciae, mostly with an astragalus on the obv.; 179 coins of Campanian fabric (*nomine Romanorum*); eleven coins of Roman mintage; and 51 from provincial mints, at Neapolis, Cales, Cosa, etc.[3]

Sala Consilina (*Lucania*).—Part of a Geometrical vase of Italian fabric has been found; it is decorated in panels like the Dipylon vases, with swastikas and diaper patterns; but for technical reasons cannot be of Greek origin.[3]

Tarentum.—A treasure of silver vases has come to light. The finest piece is a plate with busts of a youthful Satyr and a Maenad embracing, in high relief in the centre; the composition is fine and the workmanship excellent. Besides this may be mentioned a pyxis with three figures in relief on the top, resembling the compositions on Italian mirror-cases; the figures are much oxidised and cannot be identified with certainty, but one appears to be Nike; two canthari and a stand for a vase; three small feet (of a cista?) in the form of Sirens; two handles of vases, and fragments of a vase with scale-pattern chased on the exteriors.

Reggio.—A bronze stamp in the form of a ship has been found here, inscribed GAVDET, which appears to be meant for GAVDENTI (cf. *C.I.L.* x. 8059,176–177; this would of course be a proper name, Gaudentius); GAVDEAS, as a salutation, also occurs (*C.I.L.* x. 8059,497 and an example in Brit. Mus.).[2]

BALKAN PENINSULA.

Konjica, Herzegovina.—In February last a sanctuary of Mithras was excavated, being the first of the kind to turn up in the Balkan Peninsula. It throws light on many important details in connection with the arrangement of such sanctuaries. The most important find was an altar with reliefs on the two long sides; on the front is the sacrifice of the bull, with a dedicatory inscription; on the back, the sacrificial feast. The reliefs were so placed that they could be seen from both sides; they supply many details to fill up gaps in our knowledge of the Mithras cult. That they are of local make is indicated by the fact that the stone can be identified as coming from a neighbouring quarry.[4]

AFRICA.

Timgad, Algeria.—The French excavations here are making good progress, and several buildings of the Antonine epoch have been found, including the Capitol, with statues of Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva; the Thermae with hot, cold, and tepid rooms; and assembly rooms, in which the arrangements for warming are still visible under the pavements. The forum is one of the most interesting known, with remarkable columns. Of the theatre there are considerable remains in the middle of the city; it accommodated three or four thousand. The places for the upper classes and officials in the orchestra can still be identified, and the wall of the stage and other smaller details are well preserved.[4]

H. B. Walters.

Revue Numismatique. Part iv. 1896.

J. Rouvier. 'Une métropole phénicienne oubliée: Laodicée, métropole de Canaan.' (concluded).—E. Babelon. 'Medaillion d'or de Gallien et de Salonine.' A large gold medallion, of the weight of ten aurei, lately acquired by the Bibliothèque nationale. It came from Egypt where it had been used by a fellah as an amulet. *Obv.* CONCORDIA AVGG. Bust of Gallienus and Salonina. *Rev.* PIETASFALERI. Beneath a tree, a goat suckling a child; another child and an eagle are near the goat; in the exergue, a thunderbolt. The goat is explained as Amaltheia. The two children are Jupiter Dijovis and Vejovis, worshipped at Falerii. The 'Pietas Faleri' and the 'Virtus Faleri' (on a bronze coin of Gallienus) recall the virtues of the giant Valerius or Valens, the ancestor of the *Gens Valeria* from which Gallienus boasted his descent. The medallion was probably struck in A.D. 262, a year of plague and political disaster.—*Necrologie.* Alexandre Boutkowski who died at Paris 26, Oct., 1896 was possessed of considerable stores of numismatic lore, but he was an uncritical and often inaccurate worker. His *Dictionnaire Numismatique* and *Petit Mionnet* contain some useful references but have to be used with the utmost caution.

---

[1] *Notizie dei Lincei*, August 1896.
[2] *Ibid.* July 1896.
[3] *Notizie dei Lincei*, Sept. 1896.
[4] *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 13 March 1897.

Revue belge de Numismatique (Bruxelles) for 1896.

M. C. Soutzo. Poids antiques autonomes de Tomis.' p. 389 ff.

Zeitschrift für Numismatik (Berlin). Vol. xx. parts 3 and 4 (1897).

F. Quilling. 'Ausgewählte römische Münzen und Medaillen de städtischen Münzsammlung in Frankfurt a. M.'—A. Von Sallet. 'Silbermünze eines baktrischen Königs Antiochus.'—E. Pernice. 'Ueber den Wert der monumentalen und litterarischen Quellen über Metrologie.'—E. J. Seltmann. 'Unedirte römische Kaisermünzen.'—F. Imhoof-Blumer. 'Zur Münzkunde des Pontos, von Paphlagonien, Tenedos, Aiolis und Lesbos.' *Amisos.* The Tyche of the city is seen seated with her rudder placed on a small head which has been called Sarapis, Zeus or Gaia. The head has horns or rather perhaps crab's claws attached to it, and it is suggested that Thalassa or the Pontos Euxeinos is represented. Similar representations of Thalassa are cited at Laodicea in Phrygia, Perinthos and Korykos. *Komana* (Pontus). Representations of the Goddess Ma or Enyo with her club. *Sebasteia on the Halys* (*Sivas*). A coin of Valerian inscribed [CE]BACTHNWN is attributed to this town: it is dated from an era beginning, probably, B.C. 2–1. *Aboniteichos Ionopolis.* A coin of Trebonianus Gallus, *reverse* ZEΦYPIC IΩNOΠO-ΛEITΩN naked male figure standing with right arm raised, apparently a representation of the West Wind (Ζέφυρις for Ζέφυρος). *Amastris. Rev.* Hermes holding caduceus and discus. The latter attribute of Hermes had not previously been recognized on coins. *Haimilion.* Bronze coins, *circ.* B.C. 63, inscribed AIMIΛIOY and apparently issued by a Paphlagonian or Pontic town Αἱμίλιον or Αἱμίλιος. *Tenedos.* Reverse-type with the double-axe represented on a kind of stand. On another specimen an amphora is attached to the double-axe by a taenia. By these representations, it is rendered probable that the πέλεκυς was a sacred object, preserved possibly in the temple of Tenes. *Aigai* (Aeolis). Bronze coin of the time of Titus and Domitian. The magistrate Apollonios has the title Νεμεονίκης *i.e.* Victor in the Nemean Games; cp. Ὀλυμπιονίκης on a coin of Philadelphia. *Kyme* (Aeolis). Representations of the Kymaean Sibyll. *Methymna.* Head of Dionysos Φαλλήν. *Mytilene.* Two additions to the numismatic 'Portraits of famous citizens of Mytilene' published by me in the *Classical Review* for May 1894, pp. 226, 227; cp. Brit. Mus. Catal. *Troas, Aeolis and Lesbos,* p. lxx. ff. *Obverse* CЄ⊥TOC NЄOC MAP-[KOY ?] Head of the younger Sextus. *Reverse.* ANΔPOMЄΔA NЄA ΛЄCBΩ (νακτος). Head of the younger Andromeda. These personages are not elsewhere mentioned. This Sextus (son of Marcus?) appears to be distinct from Sexstos ἥρως of other Mytilenaean coins. Andromeda is probably his wife, and daughter of Lesbonax ἥρως νέος who, according to Imhoof-Blumer's view, is distinct from Lesbonax the philosopher.—H. Gaebler. 'Zur Münzkunde Macedoniens II. Die Münzen der Derronen.' Describes an unpublished coin with the inscription ΔЄRRONIKON (retrograde), *i.e.* money (ἀργύριον) of the Derroni. Hitherto, coins of this class have been supposed to bear the name of an unknown dynast Derronikos. Dr. Gaebler suggests that the Derroni dwelt in the peninsula of Sithonia (Chalcidice). Their coins resemble in style and fabric the early sixth century coins of the Bisaltae and other Thraco-Macedonian peoples.—A. Von Sallet. A note on forged Greek coins (p. 326), referring to the false coin of 'Aerminaos' and to various forgeries in the Bactrian series (Archebius and Philoxenus etc.).

WARWICK WROTH.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Journal of Philology. Vol. xxv. No. 49. 1897.

Note on Rigveda i. 48 (Hymn to the Dawn), 15, L. Horton-Smith. *Plato's Later Theory of Ideas,* J. Llewelyn Davies. A criticism of Dr. Jackson's papers under this title, and partly of Mr. Archer Hind's editions of the *Phaedo* and *Timaeus.* Notes on *Aristotle's Politics* Book i., A. Platt. *Emendationes Homericae* (Il. xiii.–xviii.), T. L. Agar. Emendations are proposed in the following passages, N 62, 256, Ξ 456, O 645, 710, Π 259, 352, P 481, 570, Σ 485, 582. *Tibulliana,* J. P. Postgate. Critical notes on various passages. *Plato's Later Theory of Ideas,* H. Jackson. This is the seventh paper, and is directed against Zeller's theory that the *Philebus* is prior to the *Republic.* Dr. Jackson deals with Zeller's two chief points, (1) the controversy about the Good, and (2) the theory of true and false pleasures. *Passages in the Poetae Lyrici,* H. Richards. *On a fragment of Solon,* R. C. Jebb. This is an answer to Prof. Platt's criticism (in the last no. of the Journal of Philology) on the opening verses of the iambic fragment of Solon in Sandys' edition of the Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία. *On the place occupied by Odysseus in Od. xxi.,* H. Hayman. Maintains that the difficulty of Prof. Platt in his article 'The Slaying of the Suitors' [see Cl. Rev. ix. 477] turns on the erroneous assumption that there was only one λάινος οὐδός opening upon the μέγαρον. *The Site of the Battle of Lake Trasimene,* B. W. Henderson. On a balancing of probabilities after a personal examination of the rival sites, the writer inclines to the opinion that the battle was fought in the defiles between Passignano and Montecolognola and not on the Tuoro site. ἱερός, ἰερός, ἰρός, C. M. Mulvany. Recommends a derivation from *σῑ-ρός = (1) 'fast' (cf. *fastness = fortress*) and (2) 'religiously fixed.' The second meaning nearly coincides with the meaning 'sacred' developed by *ι(σ)αρός, whence arose confusion of ἰρός and *ϝερός, and extension of the aspirate giving ἱερός. *Catulliana,* H. Macnaghten. Critical notes on some passages. *Horace Odes* iv. 8, A. W. Verrall. Maintains that whether Mr. Stanley's explanation of ll. 15–20 [see last no. of Journal of Philology and Cl. Rev. x. 360] is correct or not, these six lines are an interpolation.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN BOOKS.

Augustini de Catechizandis Rudibus. Edited by Rev. W. Yorke Fausset. Post 8vo. 122 pp. Methuen & Co. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Boissier (G.) Cicero and his Friends, a Study of Roman Society in the Time of Caesar, translated by A. D. Jones. Crown 8vo. 408 pp. Innes. 5*s.*

Boughton (W.) History of Ancient Peoples. With Illustrations and Map. 12mo. New York. 9*s.*

Cicero. Letters to Atticus. Book I., with Notes by A. Pretor. 3d ed. with Appendix. 12mo. 156 pp. Bell. (Public School Series.) 4*s.* 6*d.*

Concordance to the Greek New Testament according to the texts of Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf and the English Revisers. Ed. by W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden. 4to. 1050 pp. Half calf, Edinburgh, Clark. £1 11*s.* 6*d.*

Hatch (E.) Greek Ideas and Usages, their Influence upon the Christian Church. Ed. by A. M. Fairbairn. (Hibbert Lecture 1888.) 6th Edition. 8vo. 384 pp. Williams and Norgate. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Juvenal. Satires VIII., X., XVI. Translated with test papers on Satires XI., XIII., XIV. Crown 8vo. 63 pp. Clive. 2*s.* 6*d.*

—— Satires XI. XIII., XIV., edited by A. H. Allcroft. Introduction, Text, Notes. Crown 8vo. 76 pp. Clive. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Murray (G.) Ancient Greek Literature: a History. Crown 8vo. 426 pp. Heinemann. 6*s.*

Ovidius. Anderson, J. N., On the Sources of Ovid's Heroides I, III, VII, X, XII. 8vo. 140 pp.

Philip and Alexander of Macedon. Two Essays in Biography. By David G. Hogarth. 8vo. xii, 305 pp.; with map and illustrations. Murray. 14*s.*

Texts and Studies. Vol. V. No. 1. Apocrypha Anecdota II. By M. R. James. 8vo. sewed. Cambridge Press. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Tsountas (C.) and (J. T.) *Manatt*, The Mycenaean Age, a Study of the Monuments and Culture of Pre-Homeric Greece. With an Introduction by Dr. Dörpfeld. 4to. 450 pp. Macmillan. £1 4*s.*

Virgil. Eneid, Book XII., edited by A. H. Allcroft and F. G. Plaistow. Introduction, Text, Notes. Crown 8vo. 93 pp. Clive. 1*s.* 6*d.*

—— The Eclogues. Translated into English Hexameter Verse. By the Right Hon. Sir George Osborne Morgan. 4to. xv, 48 pp. Frowde. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

Αἰσχύλου δράματα σωζόμενα καὶ ἀπολωλότων ἀποσπάσματα μετὰ ἐξηγητικῶν καὶ κριτικῶν σημειωσέων τῇ συνεργασίᾳ Εὐγενίου Ζωμαρίδου ἐκδιδόμενα ὑπὸ N. Wecklein. Vol. II., III., part 1. 8vo. vii, 798 pp. 12 M.

Aristoteles. Maier (H.) Die Syllogistik des Aristoteles. I. Die logische Theorie des Urteils bei Aristoteles. 8vo. iv, 214 pp. Tübingen.

Ausonius. Poèmes divers d'Ausone, traduits par Ed. Ducoté. 16mo. v, 192 pp. Paris.

Brunn (Heinr.) Griechische Kunstgeschichte. Nachgelassene Theile, herausgegeben von A. Flasch. Vol. II. Die archaische Kunst. 8vo. xi, 281 pp. Munich, Verlagsanstalt. 7 M. 50.

Busolt (G.) Griechische Geschichte bis zur Schlacht bei Chaeroneia. Vol. III., Pt. 1. Die Pentekontaëtie. xxii, 592 pp. Gotha, Perthes. 10 M.

Cagnat (R.) L'Année épigraphique, revue des publications épigraphiques relatives à l'antiquité romaine (1896.) 8vo. 48 pp. Paris.

Catullus. Vahlen (J.) De Valerii Catulli carminibus (II.) 4to. 18 pp. Berlin.

Dio Chrysostomus. Wegehaupt (J.) De Dione Chrysostomo Xenophontis sectatore. 8vo. 86 pp. Göttingen.

Epictetus. Bruns (J.) De schola Epicteti. 8vo. 23 pp. Kiel.

Euripides. Wecklein (N.) Beiträge z. Kritik des Euripides. II. 8vo. 90 pp. München.

Gregorius Nyssenus. Reiche (A.) Die künstlerischen Elemente in der Welt- und Lebens-Anschauung des Gregor von Nyssa. 8vo. 60 pp. Jena.

Hufmayr (P. E.) Die pseudocyprianische Schrift: De Pascha Computus. 8vo. 40 pp. and table. Würzburg.

Lattmann (H.) De conjunctivo latino. 8vo. 48 pp. Ilfeld.

Linden (E.) De bello civili Sullano. 8vo. 68 pp. Freiburg.

Lorichius. Schröder (E.) Joannis Lorichii Hadamarii Jobus comoedia (ed. Marpurgi a. 1543) denuo edita. 4to. 26 pp. Marburg.

Lucretius. Hildén (C. J.) De casuum syntaxi Lucretiana. I. 8vo. 112 pp. Helsingfors.

Ovidius. Krassowsky (W.) Ovidius quomodo in isdem fabulis enarrandis a se ipso discrepuerit. 8vo. 38 pp. Königsberg. 1 M.

Pherekydes. Diels (H.) Zur Pentemychos des Pherekydes. (Aus "Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin)". 8vo. 13 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 50 Pf.

Philo. Krell (E.) Philo, περὶ τοῦ πάντα σπουδαῖον εἶναι ἐλεύθερον, die Echtheitsfrage. 8vo. 38 pp. Augsburg.

Plato. Ritter, Platos Politicus. Beiträge zu seiner Erklärung. 4to. 32 pp. Ellwangen.

Posidonius. Hultsch (F.) Poseidonios über die Grösse und Entfernung der Sonne. 4to. 48 pp., engravings. Göttingen.

Ridder. (A.) de, De ectypis quibusdam aeneis quae falso vocantur "Argivocorinthiaca." 8vo. vi, 92 pp. Paris.

Schömann (G. F.) Griechische Alterthümer. 4th Ed. by J. H. Lipsius. Vol. I: Das Staatswesen. 8vo. viii, 600 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 12 M.

Schöne (Alfr.) Uber die Ironie in der griechischen Dichtung, insbesondere bei Homer, Aeschylus und Sophocles. 8vo. 23 pp. Kiel. 1 M. 40

Seneca. Mücke (R.) De praestantia codicis Uelcensis in priore parte epistularum Senecae philosophi recensenda. 8vo. 16 pp. Ilfeld.

—— Summa (W.) Symbolae criticae ad Senecae tragoedias. 8vo. 34 pp. Neustadt.

Vandarie (H.) L'Optatif grec. Essai de syntaxe historique. 8vo. xxv, 260 pp. Paris.

Xenophon Ephesius. Mann (E.) Ueber den Sprachgebrauch des Xenophon Ephesius. 8vo. 41 pp. Kaiserslautern.

The Classical Review

JUNE 1897.

THE MINOR WORKS OF XENOPHON.

VI., VII. The Constitutions.

(*Continued from page* 136.)

When we turn to the *Respublica Atheniensium*, the conclusion is just the reverse of that which was drawn from our scrutiny of the *Respublica Lacedaemoniorum*. There is not in the language of it any word or any use of a word that is noticeably characteristic of X. No doubt the treatise is a very short one. In the Teubner text it barely fills thirteen pages, while the *R.L.* fills twenty-one. But thirteen pages give ample room for a peculiar vocabulary, such as we have now partly observed, to show itself, and yet I do not think a single thing can be pointed out that would suggest X.'s authorship to any one ignorant of the tradition. The uses of ὡς above mentioned are not to be found, though ἵνα with subjunctive and ὥστε with infinitive occur. Ἕως is used two or three times, not ἕστε: ὅπου repeatedly, never ἔνθα: there is, I think, no σύν, no ἀμφί, not a single μήν. Not one of the many words unfamiliar in Attic prose but affected by X. is here employed. Though some easy-going readers may not realise the significance of these facts, close observers of language know what they mean. There is not one of the undoubted works of X. that is not marked by peculiarities of language capable of being detected by any moderately careful student. Even the first two books of the *Hellenics*, which have been thought to be early work, contain examples (to take one point only) of X.'s characteristic use of ὡς. But in the *R.A.* there is no Xn. peculiarity of any kind.

We next go on to ask, as in the case of the *R.L.*, whether the language contains anything positive that X. probably could not or would not have used, or that is, at any rate, not in keeping with his usual manner of expression. There are a few things of this sort that may be pointed out. In speaking of politics X. does not use the names οἱ γενναῖοι and οἱ χρηστοί for the wealthy and well-born, as this writer habitually does. To X. they are the καλοὶ κἀγαθοί, etc. Indeed I doubt whether any other Greek prose writer uses γενναῖοι and χρηστοί in this semi-technical sense. When Aristotle speaks of the γενναῖοι in the *Politics*, he is not using a set term. Πονηροί is sometimes opposed to these words in the *R.A.*, though δῆμος and οἱ πένητες are used more frequently: but πονηροί is not strange to X.'s usage. Cf. *Hell.* 2, 3, 13–14 where οἱ πονηροί are opposed to οἱ καλοὶ κἀγαθοί. Thuc. 8, 47 uses πονηρία = δημοκρατία. I can not find in X. any parallel to the absolute use of δυνάμενος in 2, 18 πλούσιος ἢ γενναῖος ἢ δυνάμενος, but in Thuc. 6, 39, 2 and Plat. *Gorg.* 525 E we have οἱ δυνάμενοι used in the same way. Δημόται = δημοτικοί in 1. 4 would be unusual, though X. uses it so (*Mem.* 1, 2, 58: *Cyr.* 2, 3, 7), but probably we should read δημοτικοί here as in the two sentences before and after. (The

best MSS. seem, however, to have *ἰδιῶται*, not *δημόται*.) In 1, 6 and 9 *οἱ δεξιώτατοι* are 'the ablest men,' and *δεξιός* is familiar enough in this sense, but it seems not to occur in X. (Thuc. in a doubtful chapter (3, 82, 15) has *δεξιοί* 'clever' and *δεξιότης* in 3, 37, 3). *Διαίτημα* (1, 8) is used in *Mem.* 1, 6, 5 of matters of diet: it is not used in X. of political institutions, practices, etc. as here. Its use in Thuc. 1, 6, 2 is not exactly political. *Ἰσηγορία* (1, 12) is not found in X. *Κακονομία* (1, 8) I do not know where to find at all, but Herodotus 1, 65 has *κακόνομος*. *Εὐθενεῖν* (2, 6) and *ἐπιμίσγεσθαι* (2, 7) are not Xn. All these are words of a more or less political or social connotation, the absence of which from X. as compared with their presence here seems to deserve remark.

Taking words of a different kind, we may notice that *ὀλίγιστος* (1, 5 etc.) is a form never used by X.: that *αὐτόθι* (1, 2 and *passim*) is always used by this writer for *ἐκεῖ*, whereas X. makes free use of *ἐκεῖ* and *ἐνταῦθα* as well (in 1, 11 here *ἐνταῦθα* is used vaguely, in correspondence with *ὅπου*): that *ἀντιβολεῖν* (1, 18) does not occur in X., nor *λωβᾶσθαι* (2, 13), nor *περιτιθέναι* used as in the expression *τὴν δύναμιν περιτιθέναι* (1, 2), nor *ὅσ' ἔτη* (3, 4–5 three times) or any similar phrase, nor *φέρε δή* (3, 5–6 twice), nor *ὡς ἀληθῶς* (2, 19: see Schanz in *Hermes* 21, 456). The author makes use once of *ἄττα* (2, 17), twice of the so-called article or demonstrative pronoun in a curious way (2, 8 *τοῦτο μὲν ἐκ τῆς, τοῦτο δ' ἐκ τῆς*: *ib.* 12 *τὸ μὲν τῇ, τὸ δὲ τῇ*): more than once of a *σύ*, addressed to an imaginary reader, and an *ἐγώ*, used of an imaginary self, which are certainly curious: none of these occur in X.

The use of particles is very restricted and therefore very unlike X. *Μέν, δέ, οὖν* occur often enough, but the so-called 'anaphora' with *μέν* and *δέ*, of which X. is very fond, only once (3, 2 *πολλὰ μέν..., πολλὰ δέ..., πολλὰ δέ..., πολλὰ δέ..., πολλὰ δέ...*): *αὖ* and *δ' αὖ* three or four times. *Ἔπειτα* frequently corresponds to *πρῶτον μέν*. *Δή* is used extremely little (1, 18 *ὅς ἐστι δὴ νόμος Ἀθήνησι*: 2, 11 *καὶ δή* 'suppose': 3, 2 *ἆρα δή*, a conjunction of particles perhaps not to be found elsewhere and at any rate very uncommon, as is also Cobet's *ἆρα δῆτα*: 3, 5 and 7 *φέρε δή*: 3, 9 *ὅπως δή*). *Πάνυ* is found twice (2, 3: 3, 5): *τοι* only in 3, 13, for in 3, 10 it can hardly be right: *ἄρα* in 3, 12. Even *γε* does not occur more than two or perhaps three times: *γοῦν* perhaps in 1, 13, but it may be *οὖν*. *Καί-δέ* is not found, nor, as was said above, X.'s favourite and indispensable *μήν*.

In the syntax there seems nothing distinctly noticeable. The use of *αἱροῦμαι* with accusative and infinitive (1, 1 *εἵλοντο τοὺς πονηροὺς ἄμεινον πράττειν*) is rare and might be plausibly explained by the loss of a *τό*, but it is paralleled in Plato *Phil.* 44 A. The passives *χορηγεῖται ὁ δῆμος...ὁ δὲ δῆμος τριηραρχεῖται* (1, 13) are a little odd, but we are familiar with something like the first of them in Aristotle's *κεχορηγημένος* and *ἀχορήγητος*. The accusative after *ἄχθομαι* (2, 18 *ὥστ' οὐδὲ τοὺς τοιούτους ἄχθονται κωμῳδουμένους*) occurs in *Iliad* 5, 361: 13, 352: and in Eupolis *fragm.* 43. Similar uses with *χαίρω, ἥδομαι, γέγηθα* etc. may be found in Homer and later poets (*γέγηθα τὸν ἄνδρα* Cratinus *fragm.* 158). Aristotle's *τοὺς πατραλοίας καὶ μιαιφόνους, ὅταν τύχωσι τιμωρίας, οὐδεὶς ἂν λυπηθείη χρηστός* (*Rhet.* 2, 9, 1386 b 28) is perhaps rather anacoluthic than an instance of this construction, which seems somewhat poetical and old.

On the whole it may be said that the positive facts, though far from conclusive against X.'s authorship, go to strengthen the argument derived from the negative evidence, the absence of regular Xn. expressions. On the ground of this marked difference of style, consisting mainly but not entirely in the absence of all such turns of expression as we know from the body of his writings to have been habitually used by X., we ought to have no hesitation in adopting the opinion now generally held among scholars, though they have perhaps usually arrived at it in another way, that the book is the work of another man. Cobet indeed, whose opinion when given with due care outweighs that of many ordinary scholars, thought it X.'s, but further examination would probably have made him change his mind, as he did the reverse way with regard to the *R.L.*

But there suggests itself here another kindred question. Can any inference be drawn from the character of the Greek as to the date at which it was written? On this point the most conflicting views have been held, resting both on the language and on the contents. It has been deemed earlier than any extant comedy of Aristophanes (425 B.C.): it has also been ascribed to Macedonian times. Is it our earliest specimen of Attic prose literature? or is it, as J. J. Hartman seems to think, composed at a late date by some one who had, like ourselves, the older Attic writers before him and who put together from his study of them a sort of imaginary political argument? As regards the language there would seem to be in such a question two

things to go by. One is the observation of particular facts of language, positive or negative, the presence or absence, that is, of this or that word, form, idiom, etc.: the other is the feeling aroused by whole sentences and paragraphs.

With regard to the first of these, I do not think any clear or strong evidence is forthcoming. The book is so short and our knowledge of early Attic prose is so limited, that very little can be made out, as it seems to me, on this head. I will call attention, however, to a few small things. One of the most noticeable, though it may seem small enough, is the fact that the writer always uses *σφῶν αὐτῶν*, etc. never *ἑαυτῶν*, etc. Kühner, who notices this, points out (1, § 168) that the older Attic prose-writers usually employ *σφῶν αὐτῶν*, etc., except in the case of a possessive *ἑαυτῶν* following the article, e.g. *τὰ ἑαυτῶν* (we have in the *R.A.* 2, 14 *οὐδὲν τῶν σφῶν*, if this is not a mistake for *σφετέρων*), but that the other form gradually established itself as the one in common use. See too Meisterhans, § 59. Except in the *Hellenics* and one or two isolated instances X. uses *ἑαυτῶν*. The invariable use of the longer form in the *R.A.* therefore points to an early date. So to some extent does the use of the simple *σφίσι*, (1, 3 and 14) which gets rarer and rarer in Attic (occasional in X. and even in Demosthenes; never, I think, in Aristophanes, but his sentences did not want it): and the use of the pronoun *οἷ* (2, 17) of which the same may be said (never, I think, in Lysias, Isocrates, or Demosthenes): but not much stress can be laid on these words. Ατε occurs freely in Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato, sometimes in lyrical poetry, whereas it is practically unknown in the orators and in comedy (it is said to occur once in Aristophanes and once in a fragment of Cratinus). We may therefore conclude it to be a mark of an early vocabulary rather than a late. We find it here twice (1, 20: 2, 14). Ἄσσα or *ἄττα* (2, 17) belongs, I think, more to old Attic than to new, if we may judge from its frequency in Aristophanes compared with its rarity or absence in the fragments of the New Comedy. Jacob's index in Meineke gives no example from the latter. We find it only twice in all Demosthenes, and apparently not at all in Lysias: pretty often in Plato, but this is consistent with its being old-fashioned. On the other hand neither Thucydides (who twice has *ἄττα*) nor, I think, X. uses it. It is noticeable again that the author of the *R.A.* uses not *ἐκεῖ* or *ἐνταῦθα*, but *αὐτόθι* (1, 2, etc.): this, if I am not mistaken, also goes slightly in the same direction, for we must observe the absence of *ἐκεῖ* as well as the use of *αὐτόθι*. The author uses *ἔνι* for *ἔνεστι* (1, 5 and 16), but this is found in all ages of Attic. He also uses *ἔνιοι* (2, 10) and *ἐνίοτε* (2, 4: 3, 1) which do not occur at all in Thucydides, and in Aristophanes only in the latest of the comedies (*Plut.* 867, 1125). Herodotus, however, and Hippocrates use *ἔνιοι* and Hippocrates at any rate *ἐνίοτε*. I take some of the words mentioned above, such as *ἐπιμίσγομαι*, and *ὀλίγιστος*, to belong rather to the older language. So does *ἐξαπιναῖος* (3, 5) which is found two or three times in X. and in the adverbial form in Thucydides, not in the orators nor even in Plato, though the latter once has *ἐξαπίνης*.

The very small use of particles, on which I have remarked above, seems also to indicate an early date. So does the very small use of the infinitive with an article (see Goodwin, § 788 and notes), which will, however, be found in 1, 3: 2, 17 and a few other places. The complete indifference to hiatus is an argument *pro tanto* in the same direction.

I do not know of anything in the language of the book that tells the other way and in favour of a comparatively late date, unless it be the *ττ* in such words as *πράττειν*, *ἥττους* (there seem to be some variations in the MSS.: Dindorf, p. xvi.), and the *σ* in *σύν*. But we know too little about these spellings in literature to attach much importance to them, and in any case what we now find in the MSS. of the *R.A.* could not be taken as good evidence. In a work regarded as X.'s divergences of spelling were likely enough to be removed. The author may quite well have written *πράσσειν*, though we do not find it in his text.

If now we pass away from the consideration of single words and phrases and ask what impression with regard to the age of the Greek is made by the general cast and style of the sentences, it is not very easy to give any confident answer, and as a matter of fact scholars have not been agreed. The most striking feature of the style to my mind is the extreme simplicity of it, a simplicity greater, when we consider the subject-matter, than that of Lysias or perhaps even of Caesar. The words are the simplest and, so to say, baldest that could be found: the sentences are extraordinarily simple in their structure, and their succession and mutual relations are of the most elementary kind. This might be consciously

elaborated by a skilful writer, but the impression it makes on me is certainly that of early prose. It has not the stiffness of Thucydides, when reasoning, and of Antiphon: it shows no sign of art, unless it be the art of studied simplicity. There is a slight archaic formality about it now and then, which belongs to the fifth century rather than the fourth: I mean especially the repetition in neighbouring clauses of identical words, which a writer who had come under the influence of professors of style would have been likely to vary or omit. The first two sections of the book will illustrate this habit, which Blass too has noticed. Take the beginning of it, *περὶ δὲ τῆς Ἀθηναίων πολιτείας, ὅτι μὲν εἵλοντο τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον τῆς πολιτείας οὐκ ἐπαινῶ διὰ τόδε, ὅτι ταῦθ' ἑλόμενοι εἵλοντο τοὺς πονηροὺς ἄμεινον πράττειν ἢ τοὺς χρηστούς· διὰ μὲν τοῦτο οὐκ ἐπαινῶ*, and observe the repetition of *εἵλοντο* after *ἑλόμενοι* and still more of *διὰ μὲν τοῦτο οὐκ ἐπαινῶ*. Then in *πρῶτον μὲν οὖν τοῦτο ἐρῶ ὅτι δικαίως δοκοῦσιν* (so Kirchhoff) *αὐτόθι οἱ πένητες καὶ ὁ δῆμος πλέον ἔχειν τῶν γενναίων καὶ τῶν πλουσίων διὰ τόδε ὅτι ὁ δῆμός ἐστιν ὁ ἐλαύνων τὰς ναῦς καὶ ὁ τὴν δύναμιν περιτιθεὶς τῇ πόλει· καὶ οἱ κυβερνῆται καὶ οἱ κελευσταὶ καὶ οἱ πεντηκόνταρχοι καὶ οἱ πρῳρᾶται καὶ οἱ ναυπηγοὶ οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὴν δύναμιν περιτιθέντες τῇ πόλει πολὺ μᾶλλον ἢ οἱ ὁπλῖται καί οἱ γενναῖοι καὶ οἱ χρηστοί*, observe the repetition in *τὴν δύναμιν περιτιθέντες τῇ πόλει* and in *οἱ γενναῖοι καὶ οἱ χρηστοί*. Cf. 2, 11 *εἰ γάρ τις πόλις πλουτεῖ ξύλοις ναυπηγησίμοις, ποῖ διαθήσεται, ἐὰν μὴ πείσῃ τοὺς ἄρχοντας τῆς θαλάττης;* *τί δ' εἴ τις σιδήρῳ ἢ χαλκῷ ἢ λίνῳ πλουτεῖ πόλις, ποῖ διαθήσεται, ἐὰν μὴ πείσῃ τοὺς ἄρχοντας τῆς θαλάττης;* or 3, 10 *ἐν οὐδεμιᾷ γὰρ πόλει τὸ βέλτιστον εὖνουν ἐστὶ τῷ δήμῳ, ἀλλὰ τὸ κάκιστον ἐν ἑκάστῃ ἐστὶ πόλει εὔνουν τῷ δήμῳ;* or the two last sections of the book. Somewhat similar is the careful repetition of a preposition before each of the words it governs and, as in the second sentence quoted, of the article with every substantive. All this has an old-fashioned unsophisticated air about it, though the air may have been assumed. But it must be allowed at the same time that Greek writing of all ages occasionally shows something of the kind I am dwelling upon. In saying therefore that the style of the *R.A.* feels like the style of early times, I admit that my impression, though decided, is not one for which I can assign a reason convincing to other people, and such impressions are not much to be trusted.

Returning now for a moment to the question of authorship, I would repeat that on the ground of language alone, observing first and mainly the un-Xenophontean, and secondly the probably early, character of it, we may conclude the treatise not to be X.'s. But when we take into account the further considerations, with which in this article I do not deal, derived from the matter of the book, the argument seems to become overwhelming. The tone and spirit of the writer are absolutely unlike the tone and spirit of X. All the indications given by reference to matters of fact seem to point to a date earlier than his. Athens is not only a strong naval power, but undisputed mistress of the sea. The *φόρος* is still paid by her subject-states. Their citizens still come to her courts for the decision of lawsuits. The sovereign people must not be laughed at in a comedy, though Demos is unmistakably laughed at in a certain famous play which won the prize in 424 and has been preserved to our own times. The reputed X. lays it down that a man of the people is not attacked in comedy, *ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πολυπραγμοσύνην καὶ διὰ τὸ ζητεῖν πλέον τι ἔχειν τοῦ δήμου*, though Socrates, X.'s master and hero, was grossly caricatured on the Athenian stage in 423.

Language therefore and contents alike make it certain that Xenophon was not the author.

This would seem to be the place for hazarding a conjecture on the passage in Diogenes Laertius, which ranks the *R.A.* among the writings of X. but mentions a doubt that had been expressed about the *R.L.* He gives (2, 6, 13) a list of X.'s works, ending thus—*Ἀγησίλαόν τε καὶ Ἀθηναίων καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων Πολιτείαν, ἣν φησιν οὐκ εἶναι Ξενοφῶντος ὁ Μάγνης Δημήτριος.* Demetrius Magnes, a contemporary of Cicero, appears also to have denied the authenticity of the speech against Demosthenes ascribed to Dinarchus. He denied it on the ground of style (*πολὺ γὰρ ἀπέχει τοῦ χαρακτῆρος* ap. Dion. Hal. *de Din. Iudic*, 1). I have shown that in the case of the *R.L.* there is no reason on grounds of style for denying X.'s authorship, whereas in the case of the *R.A.* there is very strong reason indeed. I conjecture that it was in reality the *R.A.* and not the *R.L.* of which the genuineness was denied by Demetrius, and that the names of the two *Constitutions* have accidentally changed places in Diogenes' list. This might very easily happen, and some slight confirmation of the suspicion may perhaps be found in the fact that the traditional order seems to put the *R.A.* after, not before the *R.L.* In all Kirchhoff's

MSS. with the exception of one (to which the *R.A.* and the *De Vectigalibus* have been prefixed subsequently, belonging really to a quite different *codex*) the *R.L.* seems to come first and the *R.A.* second. The order in Diogenes is the reverse of this. I suggest that he really mentioned the *R.A.* last, and that it was the *R.A.* which Demetrius called in question.

Bergk (*Griech. Lit.* iv. p. 312) supposes X.'s son Diodorus to have erroneously included the *R.A.* in an 'edition' of X.'s works. Diodorus ought to have known his father's style better, especially if, as Bergk fancies, he adopted it so well upon occasion.

There are one or two further questions on which a word may be said. First, was the *R.A.* written by an Athenian and at Athens? There is nothing to imply Athenian birth, except that twice in 1, 12 the writer uses the first person plural in speaking of what was done at Athens (*ἰσηγορίαν...ἐποιήσαμεν*). This may seem conclusive, but as he never uses this way of speaking elsewhere, but throughout the book speaks of the Athenians in the third person, and as *ἐποίησαν* could be corrupted to *ἐποιήσαμεν* without much difficulty, I do not feel very confident that the author really used the first person here. Weiske thought *ἐποίησαν* should be read, and Schneider inclined to agree. In 1, 11 Kirchhoff's *λαμβάνωμεν* is a very doubtful conjecture; but, if right, it is general and impersonal in meaning, like the *ἡμῖν* in 2, 12 which Dindorf (p. xvi.) misunderstood. The author habitually expresses 'at Athens' as I have noticed above, by *αὐτόθι*, which certainly means 'there,' not 'here.' Indeed I am not sure that *αὐτόθι* ever means distinctly 'here,' though L. and S. say it sometimes does. Nor is there anything else in the book, as far as I can see, which indicates any personal interest in Athenian affairs, or at all implies Athenian authorship. There is a tone of absolute aloofness about the whole composition, such as we are accustomed to find in Aristotle. On the other hand it is written apparently in the purest Attic Greek, and the author is familiar with Athenian institutions and customs. There would seem therefore to be no sufficient ground for deciding between two or three possible alternatives. He may have been an Athenian writing away from Athens, like Xenophon: he may have been an Athenian writing in Athens, but by the use of *αὐτόθι* putting aside his 'local habitation': he may, for anything I can see, have been a Greek of some other origin, perhaps an Athenian metic, who had a command of the Attic idiom. Attempts not only to fix the authorship on an Athenian but to name him seem unreasonable.

Again, have we only fragments and excerpts of a considerably longer work? I can see no good reason for thinking so. No doubt our text is imperfect in many places, and often we cannot reasonably hope to restore it. But there is no evidence of more than corruption and the loss of a few words or lines. No doubt, too, the author might have found many other things to say, but the treatise is fairly consecutive, and from its own point of view we have no right to regard it as obviously incomplete. Its argument is that, granted democracy and command of the sea, Athenian institutions are intelligent and intelligible enough, and that the Athenian people are by no means such fools as some of their critics deem them. This is worked out in application to several subjects, and then the treatise comes to an end.

Cobet held the opposite view and suggested, without laying much stress upon it, that the longer original work was a dialogue (written by X. himself), of which we have only fragments put together without the dialogue form. *Colloquii obscura quaedam vestigia cernere mihi videor* he says, founding himself on the above-noticed curious use of *σύ* and *σός*, which he cannot believe to be used of an imaginary reader. (Wachsmuth, as I gather from Rettig's paper on the *R.A.*, has worked out this dialogue theory elaborately.) The passage on which Cobet seems to lay most stress is 1, 11 *ὅπου δ' εἰσί πλούσιοι δοῦλοι, οὐκέτι ἐνταῦθα λυσιτελεῖ τὸν ἐμὸν δοῦλον σὲ δεδιέναι· ἐν δὲ τῇ Λακεδαίμονι ὁ ἐμὸς δοῦλος σὲ δέδοικεν· ἂν δὲ δεδίῃ ὁ σὸς δοῦλος ἐμέ, κινδυνεύσει κ.τ.λ.*, but there are several others where *ἐγώ* and *σύ* are used in a similar way. The point is that, though the verb in the second person is used thus in Greek, *e.g.* the Homeric *φαίης κεν*, yet *σύ* is not employed with it. So in this very treatise 2, 5 *οἷόν τ' ἀποπλεῦσαι ἀπὸ τῆς σφετέρας αὐτῶν ὁπόσον βούλει πλοῦν*, unless we are to read *βούλονται* with Cobet. Ἐγώ is also used in an uncommon way in these passages and in 2, 12. On the other hand, if we are to take *ἐγώ* and *σύ* as real persons or as persons in a dialogue, we are involved in difficulties. Here in 1, 11 they will both be Spartans, for the author is clearly speaking of the natives of a place and the slaves of natives, not of visitors and their slaves. Yet in 1, 10, when he says of Athens *οὔτε πατάξαι* (*τὸν δοῦλον*)

ἔξεστιν αὐτόθι οὔτε ὑπεκστήσεταί σοι ὁ δοῦλος, σοι appears to mean an Athenian gentleman, for it is he, not a stranger, whose liberty and privileges are thus curtailed. There would be no point in it, if he were not speaking of natives. Again in 2, 11 and 12 καὶ δὴ νῆές μοί εἰσι, and ἐγὼ μέν...ταῦτα ἔχω διὰ τὴν θάλατταν, the speaker either is, or for the sake of argument supposes himself to be, an Athenian. These passages seem inconsistent with Cobet's view that the pronouns must refer to some one person respectively, either real or endowed in a dialogue with an imaginary but fixed personality. Such a person could not be both Spartan and Athenian. They seem to me also inconsistent with the view of Roscher and others (mentioned in Sauppe's preface) that the *R.A.* is a letter from an Athenian to a Spartan. The use of ἐγώ and σύ, though rare, is not unique. Blass in his *Attische Beredsamkeit*, i. p. 276, quotes from the *De Anima*, 3, 2, 426 b 19, κἂν εἰ τοῦ μὲν ἐγώ, τοῦ δὲ σὺ αἴσθοιο: and cf. the οἷς ἂν ἐγὼ ληφθείην of Dem. 9, 17 cited in this *Review*, x. 381. Another example may possibly be found at the beginning of the extract from Teles, περὶ αὐταρκείας given in Stobaeus, *Flor.* 5, 67, σὺ μὲν ἄρχεις καλῶς ἐγὼ δὲ ἄρχομαι κ.τ.λ., but the parallel passage in the extract from the περὶ φυγῆς (*ib.* 40, 8) goes to show that the words, which are apparently quoted from Bion (see the *prolegomena* to Hense's *Teletis Reliquiae*, p. xxx.), are taken from a dialogue. In any case I hold it to be clear that in these passages of the *R.A.* both ἐγώ and σύ are used as imaginary illustrations, and that therefore 'γώ is a Spartan in 1, 11 and an Athenian in 2, 11–12 and σύ is both (1, 11 and 1, 10) in like manner. It should be noticed that in 3, 5 οὐκ οἴεσθε seems an inevitable correction for οὐκ οἴεσθαι, just as the MSS. have φοβεῖσθαι for φοβεῖσθε in the very similar place *Vect.* 4, 32, and that the plural must be addressed to imaginary readers or hearers.

Finally, what is the exact tone and spirit in which the author writes? I cannot think those critics (*e.g.* Mure, Thirlwall, Forbes in the introduction to his *Thucydides*, *Book* i., Blass, Müller-Strübing) understand him correctly, who talk of satire, banter, *persiflage*, irony. There seems to me to be nothing of the kind from beginning to end. There is a curiously cold, detached tone as of scientific or abstract politics, putting aside considerations of justice, passing over the question whether popular government and the well-being of the masses of the people are right and proper things for the Athenians to aim at, and asking only whether the means are well adapted to the end in view. We are apt to call this Machiavellian. It is also Aristotelian, not to say Thucydidean. But no writer has adopted the tone with more complete composure than the writer of these few pages. The critics mistake his plain, frank, 'positive' way of putting things for satire: it is not satire, it is political science. If we take parts of the book for satire, there will be the most incongruous mixture of satire with plain unsatirical reasoning. Observe for instance that in 1, 18–19 the account of one reason why the allies are made to come to Athens for their law is instantly followed by a perfectly matter-of-fact and grave statement of an advantage the Athenians derive from possessions and empire over the sea. If we had the first by itself, the statement of how the allies are taught to respect not only the sovereign people but every individual who is part of it; a statement highly suggestive of the *Wasps* of Aristophanes and even thought to be borrowed from it, there would be some plausibility in taking it for satire. But there immediately follows another statement, that by going constantly to and fro between Athens and their private properties or public dependencies across the water the Athenians are always insensibly learning seamanship. This is not a joke, and no humourist would have added it to something he meant for satire. Swift and Defoe do not mix satire and common sense in this particular way. Their satire is all of a piece. If there is any satire in what the author of the *R.A.* says, it is in the facts stated and not in the mind of the writer. He says explicitly, 'I don't approve of the end they aim at, the form of government they adopt: but I should like to convince you that, given that, their system is a very rational and effective one.' He is putting himself with rare impersonality at their point of view: he is not caricaturing it at all. It is Aristotle, not Aristophanes, we must compare him with.

The particular passages of the *R.A.* on which I have any comments to make are very few in number. It is still full of imperfections and uncertainties, but they seem now to be mostly of that kind in which it is easy enough to see what a writer may have said but impossible to be certain what he did say. It is not a question of correcting or inserting a single word, but of putting right whole sentences. Kirchhoff's third

edition (Berlin, 1889) has gone at least as far in this direction as a prudent editor can go.

Since writing the following remarks, I have made acquaintance with the dissertation and text, accompanied by critical notes, published in *Philologus* Suppl. iv. by Müller-Strübing. He has anticipated me in two or three suggested readings.

1, 1. *ὡς εὖ διασῴζονται τὴν πολιτείαν καὶ τἄλλα διαπράττονται ἃ δοκοῦσιν ἁμαρτάνειν τοῖς ἄλλοις Ἕλλησι.*

Kirchhoff follows Cobet in adding *τε* after *διασῴζονται*. Perhaps we should rather add *γνώμῃ* before *διαπράττονται*. Cf. 3, 10. *δοκοῦσι δέ Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ὀρθῶς βουλεύεσθαι . . . . . οἱ δὲ τοῦτο γνώμῃ ποιοῦσιν*: and 1, 11. So K. has proposed to insert *γνώμῃ* before *οὕτω καθέστηκε* in 2, 1.

1, 3. *οὔτε τῶν στρατηγικῶν κλήρων οἴονταί σφισι χρῆναι μετεῖναι οὔτε τῶν ἱππαρχιῶν.* Κλήρων should, I think, be *κλήρῳ*. Cf. the words just before: *πᾶσι τῶν ἀρχῶν μετεῖναι ἔν τε τῷ κλήρῳ καὶ ἐν τῇ χειροτονίᾳ.* Probably K. is right in adopting Cobet's *στρατηγιῶν*, but why should *κλήρων* be omitted together?

1, 5. *ἐν γὰρ τοῖς βελτίστοις . . . ἐν δὲ τῷ δήμῳ κ.τ.λ.*

Probably *ἐν* < *μὲν* > *γάρ*.

1, 6. *εἰ μὲν γὰρ οἱ χρηστοὶ ἔλεγον καὶ ἐβούλευον.*

Μόνοι seems to be wanted with *οἱ χρηστοί*. (So Müller-Strübing).

1, 14. *περὶ δὲ τῶν συμμάχων, ὅτι κ.τ.λ.*

There is no construction for *ὅτι*, which Dindorf therefore brackets. Read < *ἐρῶ* > *ὅτι*, as in 1, 2 *πρῶτον μὲν οὖν τοῦτο ἐρῶ, ὅτι κ.τ.λ.*

Ibid. συκοφαντοῦσι . . καὶ μισοῦσι τοὺς χρηστούς.

Μισοῦσι has been doubted but is confirmed by 2, 19 *τοὺς δὲ χρηστοὺς μισοῦσι μᾶλλον.*

2, 2. *τοῖς μὲν κατὰ γῆν ἀρχομένοις οἷόν τ' ἐστὶν ἐκ μικρῶν πόλεων συνοικισθέντας ἀθρόους μάχεσθαι.*

Συνοικισθέντας seems to be entirely misused here and must, I think, be wrong. Should we read *συναλισθέντας*? (*συναλισθέντας* or *συναθροισθέντας*, Müller-Strübing).

2, 3. *αἱ μὲν μεγάλαι (πόλεις) διὰ δέος ἄρχονται, αἱ δὲ μικραὶ πάνυ* (Cobet adds *καὶ*) *διὰ χρείαν.*

K. suggests making *δέος* and *χρείαν* change places. In the principle of this I concur, for fear is much more applicable to small cities and convenience to large ones. But I would rather get the right meaning by exchanging the places of *μεγάλαι* and *μικραί*. It seems more natural to take the small places first. Πάνυ too goes better with *μεγάλαι*.

2, 7. *τρόπους εὐωχιῶν ἐξηῦρον.*

Do we not seem to want < *πολλοὺς* > *τρόπους*, or something like it?

2, 11. *τὸν δὲ πλοῦτον μόνοι οἷοί τ' εἰσὶν ἔχειν τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ τῶν βαρβάρων.*

This statement seems too unqualified to be right, but I do not distinctly see what limitation should be put upon it.

2, 12. *ἐγὼ μὲν οὐδὲν ποιῶν ἐκ τῆς γῆς πάντα ταῦτα ἔχω διὰ τὴν θάλατταν.*

There is no need to follow Schneider in reading *πονῶν* and so leaving *ἐκ τῆς γῆς* with no proper construction. Cf. Ar. *Peace* 1322 *κριθὰς ποιεῖν*: Dem. 42, 20 *ποιῆς σίτου μὲν μεδίμνους πλέον ἢ χιλίους, οἴνου δὲ κ.τ.λ.*: [Aristot.] *Ἀθ. Πολ.* 7, 4 *ποιῇ πεντακόσια μέτρα . . ξηρὰ καὶ ὑγρά.*

2, 15. *πρὸς δὲ τούτοις καὶ ἑτέρου δέους ἀπηλλαγμένοι ἂν ἦσαν, εἰ νῆσον ᾤκουν, μηδέποτε προδοθῆναι τὴν πόλιν κ.τ.λ.*

It is just possible that *μηδέποτε προδοθῆναι* may be explained as a very loose construction after *δέους ἀπηλλαγμένοι*, as though those words = *πιστεύοντες*: but such a construction is so out of keeping with the simple and exact grammar of this book that I should rather suppose some participle like *πιστεύοντες* to have been lost. Προδοθῆναι seems in any case to require an *ἄν*.

2, 20. *ὅστις δὲ μὴ ὢν τοῦ δήμου εἵλετο ἐν δημοκρατουμένῃ πόλει οἰκεῖν μᾶλλον ἢ ἐν ὀλιγαρχουμένῃ ἀδικεῖν παρεσκευάσατο.*

Why does Prof. Mahaffy think this sentence aimed at Alcibiades? Was he the only man *μὴ ὢν τοῦ δήμου* who lived at Athens? If it refers, as probably it does, to politicians, why should it not refer to Pericles himself? But, as a matter of fact, it is perfectly general. Perhaps it may be worth while to point out how completely for once the writer has allowed his *animus* to get the better of his usual cool judgment, writing as though it was entirely optional with a man where he would live, and the easiest thing in the world for an Athenian aristocrat to migrate somewhere else. Cf. however, Plato, *Crito* 52 E.

3, 1. *καὶ τοῦτο Ἀθήνησι γίγνεται κ.τ.λ.*

Logic seems rather to require *καί* <*τοι*>.

3, 2. *δεῖ ἑορτάσαι ἑορτὰς ὅσας οὐδεμία τῶν Ἑλληνίδων πόλεων.*

If in 2, 8 Kirchhoff writes *οἱ* <*ἄλλοι*> *Ἕλληνες*, he ought to write here *οὐδεμία* <*ἄλλη*>. So in 1, 1 and repeatedly in the *R.L.* But it is probably unnecessary in either place. See the *Indices* to Demosthenes (Blass-Rehdantz) *s.v.* Ἑλλάς.

3, 6. *ὡς οὐδὲ νῦν δι' ἐνιαυτοῦ δικάζοντες ὑπάρχουσιν ὥστε παύειν τοὺς ἀδικοῦντας.*

The old emendation *ἐπαρκοῦσιν*, which

Kirchhoff and other recent editors adopt, gives the right meaning, but should probably give place to *ἀπαρκοῦσιν*. The only known place where *ἐπαρκεῖν* seemed to mean 'suffice' was the line of Solon, *δήμῳ μὲν γὰρ ἔδωκα τόσον κράτος, ὅσσον ἐπαρκεῖ*, and there Coray's conjecture of *ἀπαρκεῖ* has been confirmed by the papyrus of [Aristotle's] *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*. If *ἀπαρκοῦσιν*, and not the simple *ἀρκοῦσιν*, should be read here, it will be another instance of a distinctly old word.

3, 12. *Ὑπολάβοι δέ τις ἂν ὡς οὐδεὶς ἄρα ἀδίκως ἠτίμωται Ἀθήνησι.*

Cobet was surely right, though K. seems not to follow him, in saying that *οὐδεὶς ἄρα* κ.τ.λ. must be a question, and understanding *ὑπολάβοι* of an objection or rejoinder. Cobet omitted *ὡς*. Should we turn it into *ἴσως*?

All critics have found a want of connection between the last two sections of the book and what precedes. I should say the same of the last sentence of 1, 13 and of the whole of 2, 13. In ch. 3, the fourth section and the first half of the eighth, seem to break the sequence. Except in these places, the writing is fairly consecutive, and on this point Rettig seems more right than Kirchhoff, who finds all manner of *lacunae* and imperfections of order. But Rettig hardly succeeds in showing that 3, 12–13 would be in place after 1, 3. There seems nothing in 1, 2–3 to lead up to the *ὑπολάβοι* κ.τ.λ. of 3, 12.

Respublica Lacedaemoniorum.

1, 1. *Ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ἐννοήσας ποτέ* κ.τ.λ.

The abrupt Xn. beginning should be noticed. He likes beginning as though he were continuing. Compare particularly the first words of the *Symposium*, *Ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ* κ.τ.λ. (The *R.A.* has a *δέ* at its beginning, like the *Oeconomicus*, *Apologia*, and *Hellenics*.)

1, 4. *οὕτω καὶ ταῖς θηλείαις ἀγῶνας πρὸς ἀλλήλας ἐποίησε, νομίζων ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων ἰσχυρῶν καὶ τὰ ἔκγονα ἐρρωμενέστερα γίγνεσθαι.*

Comparison of 2, 3–6 and other places makes it pretty certain that Cobet is right in adding *ἄν* to go with *γίγνεσθαι*. Probably we should write *κἄν* for *καί*, but *ἄν* may be inserted elsewhere. There are two other passages in the book where *ἄν* seems to have been lost. In 4, 1 *νομίζων τούτους, εἰ γένοιντο οἵους δεῖ, πλεῖστον ῥέπειν ἐπὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν τῇ πόλει*, it is again probable, though not necessary, that *ἄν* should be added after *πλεῖστον*. In 8, 5 *ἐπήρετο τὸν θεὸν εἰ λῷον καὶ ἄμεινον εἴη τῇ Σπάρτῃ πειθομένῃ οἷς αὐτὸς ἔθηκε νόμοις, ἄν* seems certainly required with *εἴη*, because the thing is still future and hypothetical. In the parallel passage, *De Vectigalibus* 6, 2 *ἐπερέσθαι τοὺς θεοὺς εἰ λῷον καὶ ἄμεινον εἴη ἂν τῇ πόλει οὕτω κατασκευαζομένῃ*, Schneider and Dindorf can hardly be right in omitting *ἄν*. *Anab.* 3, 1, 7 and 6, 2, 15 are somewhat different. It is one thing to say *πότερον λῷόν ἐστι πορεύεσθαι ἢ μένειν*; another to say *πότερον λῷόν ἐστι* (for *ἔσται* or *εἴη ἄν*) *πειθομένῳ*; and the latter seems to me wrong, for *λῷόν ἐστι πειθομένῳ* implies actual obedience in present time. See, however, Goodwin 901 and 903, 7.

1, 6. *καὶ τοῦτο συμφέρον τῇ εὐγονίᾳ νομίζων.*

Probably *συμφέρειν*.

1, 7. *τἀναντία καὶ τούτου ἐνόμισε· τῷ γὰρ πρεσβύτῃ ἐποίησεν, ὁποίου ἀνδρὸς σῶμά τε καὶ ψυχὴν ἀγασθείη, τοῦτον ἐπαγομένῳ τεκνοποιήσασθαι.*

Νομίζω in the sense of *νομοθετῶ* recurs in 2, 4 *ἐνόμισεν ἐνὶ ἱματίῳ δι' ἐτοῦς προσεθίζεσθαι*, and again in 12, 3 *ἐνόμισεν ὑπὸ Σκιριτῶν προφυλάττεσθαι*. It is of course common enough as used of a number of people among whom some practice or belief exists, but as applied to a single person who enacts and establishes a practice it is not recognised in the lexicons nor perhaps to be found elsewhere in Greek of a good age. The editors however do not comment upon it, nor have I seen it pointed out by Dindorf or any one else as a peculiarity of the *R.L.* We might be disposed to doubt its correctness, but it seems sufficiently guaranteed not only by its triple use in this treatise, but by what we find in later Greek. In the *Lex. Seguer.* (Bekker's *Anecdota*, 1, p. 158) we read *νομίζω· νομοθετῶ, αἰτιατικῇ. Δίων πρώτῳ βιβλίῳ 'ταῦτά τε οὖν ὁ Νουμᾶς ἐνόμισεν.'* And we have in Dio C. 37, 20 *τοῖς ὑπ' ἐκείνου νομισθεῖσι*, and 78, 22 *τὰ νομισθέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ Μάρκου*, both in the same sense. It is certainly remarkable that the *R.L.*, which also uses *νομοθετῶ* (5, 1 : 10, 1), should have *νομίζω* three times in this sense and that it should apparently not occur elsewhere in good Greek.

With *ἐποίησεν* we should expect *τὸν πρεσβύτην*, not *τῷ πρεσβύτῃ*. Cf. 6, 1 *ἐποίησε παίδων ἕκαστον ἄρχειν*. Stephanus was perhaps right in wishing to insert *νόμον* or *νόμιμον*. We have *νόμον ἐποίησεν...τεκνοποιεῖσθαι* a few lines later and in 4, 7 *τοῖς τηλικούτοις νόμιμον ἐποίησε* κ.τ.λ. It seems barely possible to understand such a word out of *ἐνόμισε*. Cf. however such passages as in poetry *Il.*

23, 579 *εἰ δ' ἄγ' ἐγὼν αὐτὸς δικάσω, καί μ' οὔ τινα φημι ἄλλον ἐπιπλήξειν Δαναῶν· ἰθεῖα γὰρ ἔσται* (where *δίκη* is understood from *δικάσω*), and in prose Herod. 2, 65 *ἡ Αἴγυπτος...οὐ μάλα θηριώδης ἐστί· τὰ δὲ ἐόντα σφι* (*i.e. θηρία*), *ἅπαντα ἱρὰ νενόμισται*: and see Kühner § 352 d.

2, 3. It is hard to believe that *ὀρθιάδε βαίνειν* can be right, the more so as the simple *βαίνειν* is extremely rare in Attic prose. (Cf. however, *De Re Eq.* 1, 3 *ὁμοίως βαίνουσι.*) Stobaeus has *ὄρθια ἐκβαίνειν*, but *ἀναβαίνειν* is the word we seem to want.

2, 12. *εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ οἳ παντάπασι τοῦ διαλέγεσθαι τοὺς ἐραστὰς εἴργουσιν ἀπὸ τῶν παίδων.*

Should *τοῦ διαλέγεσθαι* be omitted? It has no construction and may have been added in explanation of *εἴργουσιν*.

2, 14. It seems clear that the end of Ch. 2 and the end of Ch. 3 should change places, as Weiske pointed out: but the error is a very odd one. Editors have read *παιδίσκων* for *παιδικῶν* in 3, 5 as though young men who were *ἐκ παίδων ἐκβεβηκότες* (3, 1) could be called *παιδίσκοι*. But in 4, 6 the *παιδονόμος* is still more inappropriate as X. is now speaking of *οἱ ἡβῶντες*. Whom are we to put in his place?

5, 3. *οὔτε ἔρημός ποτε ἡ τράπεζα βρωτῶν γίγνεται, ἔστ' ἂν διασκηνῶσι.*

The meaning is 'until the party breaks up.' Read therefore *διασκηνήσωσι*. The present tense would mean 'while it is breaking up.'

5, 5. Elsewhere persons of the same age sit together: *ὁ δὲ Λυκοῦργος ἐν τῇ Σπάρτῃ ἀνέμιξε παιδεύεσθαι τὰ πολλὰ τοὺς νεωτέρους ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν γεραιτέρων ἐμπειρίας.*

'Απέδειξε and *ἐνόμισε* have been suggested for *ἀνέμιξε*, but the latter is much too suitable a word to be wrong. Cobet thinks 'complura exciderunt.' Will it not be enough to read *ἀνέμιξε, < βουλόμενος > παιδεύεσθαι*, or *< ὡς >*?

6, 1. *ἐποίησε παίδων ἕκαστον ὁμοίως τῶν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων ἄρχειν· ὅταν δέ τις εἰδῇ ὅτι οὗτοι πατέρες εἰσὶ τῶν παίδων ὧν αὐτὸς ἄρχει, ἀνάγκη οὕτως ἄρχειν ὥσπερ ἂν καὶ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ἄρχεσθαι βούλοιτο.*

Editors have found it difficult to see the meaning of *οὗτοι*. Perhaps Xenophon wrote *< τοσ > οὗτοι*. He must rule justly, because there are so many fathers to retaliate on his own children if he does not.

6, 4. *ἀνοίξαντας τὰ σήμαντρα λαβόντας ὅσων ἂν δέωνται σημηναμένους καταλιπεῖν.*

We seem to want 'reseal,' *ἀνασημηναμένους, αὖθις σημηναμένους*, or an equivalent.

8, 3. *ὅσῳ γὰρ μείζω δύναμιν ἔχει ἡ ἀρχή, τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον ἡγήσαντο αὐτὴν καὶ καταπλήξειν τοὺς πολίτας.*

I think *ἔχει* should in any case be *ἔχοι*. But according to Sauppe *libri tantum non omnes habent ἄν* before *ἡγήσα< ν >το*. Perhaps therefore we should read *ἔχοι* and *μᾶλλον ἄν ἡγήσαντο . . καταπλῆξαι*, which will be a more regular sequence.

8, 4. Read *< οἱ > ἔφοροι οὖν.*

10, 2. *θεὶς γὰρ τοὺς γέροντας κυρίους τοῦ περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀγῶνος κ.τ.λ.*

There certainly seems to be some strange confusion either in the text or in the writer's mind. It is practically impossible that *ὁ περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀγών* can have here any but its ordinary meaning, which it has also in 8, 4 (*περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς εἰς ἀγῶνα καταστῆσαι*), of trial for life. Aristotle also (*Pol.* 3, 1 1275b 10) says *οἱ γέροντες τὰς φονικὰς* (*δίκας δικάζουσι*). Yet the writer immediately goes on to remarks about *ψυχῶν ἀγαθῶν κρίσις*, and *οἱ ἀγῶνες οἱ τῶν ψυχῶν* as compared with *οἱ τῶν σωμάτων*, which refer to the election of the Gerontes, as though these words (*θεὶς γὰρ κ.τ.λ.*) referred to the same thing. The well-known statement in Plutarch, *Lycurg.* 26, about the election of the Gerontes seems inconsistent with any such interpretation, even if it were the natural one.

11, 2. Something seems missing here that would explain the words *οὕτω γὰρ ἥκιστ' ἂν τὸ ἐκλεῖπον διαλάθοι.* They can hardly be justified by the bare fact that some stores were carried in waggons and some by beasts of burden.

11, 3. Lycurgus ordered the troops *στολὴν μὲν ἔχειν φοινικίδα καὶ χαλκῆν ἀσπίδα, ταύτην νομίζων ἥκιστα μὲν γυναικείᾳ κοινωνεῖν, πολεμικωτάτην δ' εἶναι· καὶ γὰρ τάχιστα λαμπρύνεται καὶ σχολαιότατα ῥυπαίνεται. ἐφῆκε δὲ καὶ κομᾶν κ.τ.λ.*

Ταύτην should refer to *στολήν* and *καὶ γάρ κ.τ.λ.* to *χαλκῆν ἀσπίδα* (cf. 13, 8), but with the present order of words this is impossible. It would be secured, if we might transfer *καὶ χαλκῆν ἀσπίδα* from its present place to follow *εἶναι*. Possibly *λαμπρύνεται* and *ῥυπαίνεται* should be infinitives.

H. Richards.

OVID'S *HEROIDES*.

(*Continued from p.* 204.)

IX 7–10.

Hoc uelit Eurystheus, uelit hoc germana Tonantis
laetaque sit uitae labe nouerca tuae;
at non ille uenis, cui nox, si creditur, una
non tanti, ut tantus conciperere, fuit.

uenis in 9, which has no tolerable sense, is given by P and G and the overwhelming majority of other MSS. Three or four have *uelit*, which Heinsius and all modern editors adopt. *βροτοῖσιν οὐδέν ἐστ' ἀπώμοτον*, but it is improbable almost to the last degree that any scribe would alter *uelit* into *uenis* here, with *ille* standing close by to protect the 3rd pers., and two other *uelit*'s hovering like guardian angels overhead.

The sentence 'cui nox una non tanti fuit, ut tantus conciperere' is the purest nonsense, and editors who deliberately retain it are merely professing their ignorance of what the Latin phrase 'non tanti fuit' means. 'Nam, si priore significatione uti uelis, quid hoc est, noluisse Iouem unam noctem accipere ea condicione, ut tantus fieret Hercules? sin altera, non minus absurdum erit, noluisse Iouem unam noctem subire, ut Hercules tantus efficeretur. praeterea utraque ratione Iuppiter dicitur noluisse Herculem magnum fieri, cum sententia poetae sit, uoluisse' Madvig opusc. ii 194. Therefore some write with a few MSS 'non *tanta*'; but the change by a copyist of *tanta* to *tanti* in this context is as nearly impossible as the change of one letter can ever be; and *tanta* after all will only mean 'tam longa', while it appears to me that the sense demands 'sat longa'. So Bentley seems to have thought, for he adopted from a few other MSS the conjecture 'non *satis*': I do not know that this is more violent than *tanta*, but violent it certainly is. Here then in a couple of verses are a couple of very unlikely alterations: we must try another road.

An expedient which may at first sight look attractive is this: to keep the pentameter unaltered and import into the hexameter some noun meaning *spatii* or *ambitus* to agree with *tanti* as a genitive of quality: 'cui nox una non tanti ambitus fuit, ut tantus conciperere'. To write *orbis* for *uenis* would be rough and unsatisfactory: a more plausible change would be to expel *ille uenis* as a stopgap for a lost word and write 'at non, <circuitus> cui' cet., supposing *circuitus* to have fallen out because of *cui*. But this incurs the same objection as *tanta*, that the sense will require not *tanti* or 'tam longi' but 'sat longi'; and I only make the suggestion in order to deter anyone else from making it.

There is another way which I think much better. Alter *uenis* (*u* = *b* and *n* = *u*) into *breuis*, and *non tanti* into a dative participle with the meaning of *laboranti*:

at non ille, *breuis* cui nox, si creditur, una
luctanti, ut tantus conciperetie, fuit.

If the initial *l* succumbed to one of the many perils of the margin, the neighbourhood of *tantus* would naturally detach *-tanti* and cause it to be taken for a separate word; and the change of the remnant *uc* into *nō* would be almost as easy as the similar change of the abbreviations *n̄c* and *u'o* which so often turns *nunc* and *vero* into *non*. *luctanti* is specially appropriate as being a uox amatoria, Prop. ii 1 13 and 15 5.

IX 43–46.

Mater abest queriturque deo placuisse potenti,
nec pater Amphitryon nec puer Hyllus adest.
arbiter Eurystheus irae Iunonis iniquae
sentitur nobis iraque longa deae.

The words 'arbiter irae' are doubtless capable of meaning what the editors take them to mean, the dispenser of the wrath of Juno. But I am astonished that either Ovid or any respectable versifier should be supposed capable of writing 'arbiter irae Iunonis iraque longa deae'. And further there is both a general and a particular reason for expecting 'arbiter' to mean something quite different. When the wife of Hercules uses such words as 'arbiter Eurystheus sentitur nobis', the reference, but for the presence of 'irae', would naturally be to Eurystheus' lordship over

the seed of Jove, and 'arbiter' would signify 'arbiter domus nostrae'. And Ovid, though I do not find that the editors mention it, is here copying the language of Virgil Aen. viii 291 *sqq.* 'ut duros mille labores | *rege sub Eurystheo fatis Iunonis iniquae* | pertulerit'. I believe then that 'arbiter' in Ovid has the same sense as 'rege' in Virgil, and that 'irae', which prevents 'arbiter' from having that sense, has usurped the place of an ablative explaining how Eurystheus came by his sovereignty. That ablative was not *fatis*, which is much too vague and Virgilian for Ovid, and would not have been lost: several words are possible, but the following seems the most apt and likely:

arbiter Eurystheus <astu> Iunonis
iniquae
sentitur nobis iraque longa deae.

In eurysthe-*us-as-tu-iu*-nonis the cause of the omission is plain: then *irae* was supplied from below. The reference of course is to Juno's famous trick narrated in Hom. Il. T 95–125: see 96 *sq.* καὶ τὸν | Ἥρη θῆλυς ἐοῦσα δολοφροσύνῃς ἀπάτησε, 106 τὸν δὲ δολοφρονέουσα προσηύδα πότνια Ἥρη, 112 Ζεὺς δ' οὔ τι δολοφροσύνην ἐνόησε. It may be worth mentioning that Ovid in his account of the retarded birth of Hercules at met. ix 285 *sqq.* has 'Iunoni iniquae' 296 and 'iniqua Iunone' 308 *sq.* Perhaps *furto* is almost equally probable.

IX 131—134.

Forsitan et pulsa Aetolide Deianira
nomine deposito paelicis uxor erit,
Eurytidosque Ioles et insanii Alcidae
turpia famosus foedera iunget
Hymen.

133 *et insanii* P, *atque insani* G and most MSS. This latter is an undisguised interpolation in aid of metre and accidence; and *insani* is at once so inept and so disgusting that there is no need to consider it. Bentley suggested *atque Inachii* or *atque Aonii*; but these are based on the falsified text of G. A much more probable conjecture would be *et Sidonii* (=Thebani), if this were not discountenanced by 101 *sq.* 'haec tu Sidonio (=Tyrio) potes insignitus amictu | dicere? non cultu lingua retenta silet?' and if you did not expect a patronymic to match 'Eurytidos'. I think however that *Sidonii* after all may have something to do with the present state of the text. If the MS reading were once upon a time *et ionii*, then *sidonii* would be a natural conjecture to restore the sense and metre, and the correction $\overset{sd}{ionii}$, by the confusion of *d* with *a*, might easily engender *insanii*. But *et ionii* would stand for *et et-ionii*, that is

Eurytidosque Ioles et *Ech*ionii Alcidae.

For a similar loss see trist. i 10 13 *uastis et* for *uasti secet*. Hercules was sixth in descent from Echion: Hipponome the mother of Amphitryon was the daughter of Menoeceus the grandson of Pentheus.

IX 153—158.

Heu deuota domus! solio sedet Agrios
alto;
Oenea desertum nuda senecta premit;
exulat ignotis Tydeus germanus in oris;
alter fatali uiuus in igne fuit;
exegit ferrum sua per praecordia mater:
impia quid dubitas Deianira mori?

156. 'Latet mendum in hoc uersu.....an *fatali uiuus in igne perit?*' Heinsius; and Bentley too adopts *perit:* Francius with more external probability proposes *cinis*, which hardly gives a just meaning. *fuit* however is quite intolerable: write

alter fatali uiuus in igne *situs*.

If you suppose the last letter to have been lost, the remnant *situ* hardly differs from *fuit* in appearance: the difference between *fuit* and *situs* in point of diction is more considerable.

X 29–32.

Inde ego, nam uentis quoque sum cru-
delibus usa,
uidi praecipiti carbasa tenta noto.
aut uidi aut tamquam quae me uidisse
putarem
frigidior glacie semianimisque fui.

In 31 *putarem* is given by P, by V (frag. Vindob. saec. xii), and by other MSS; *putaui* by G and others. *tamquam* is given by G, *fuerant* by V and others: some have *etiam*, but those appear also to have *cum* instead of *quae* and to be interpolated; and I only mention them because the second hand of P is among them, and proves, by writing *etiam*, that *etiam* was not in P.

What was in P is doubtful: Merkel says that it seems to have the same as G, *aut tamquam*, under an erasure; but the later editors Messrs Sedlmayer and Palmer represent it as giving *a///uam*, and Mr Sedlmayer adds that after *a* the remains of *ut* are discernible; and the dimensions of the gap as depicted by him and Mr Palmer will not hold more than one or at most two letters beside those two.

About the required meaning of 31 *sq.* the editors seem to be quite unanimous. Some of them fancy that the words possess it already, others know that they do not and try to confer it upon them by conjectures and fail, others try again and succeed; but the same meaning, that given for instance by Madvig's 'aut uidi aut *tantum quia* me uidisse *putaui* | frigidior glacie semianimisque fui', is the meaning sought or found by all. Very well then: throw all their explanations and all their emendations into the fire: they are vitiated through and through by an utter misconception of what Ovid is saying. It most unluckily happens that there are two passages which have a strong verbal likeness to this: xviii (Leander) 31 *sq.* 'lumina quin etiam summa uigilantia turre | *aut uidet aut* acies nostra *uidere putat*' and Verg. Aen. vi 454 '*aut uidet aut uidisse putat* per nubila lunam': critics have been led astray by these delusive parallels and have fancied that because Ovid here uses or seems to use a similar vocabulary he is conveying a similar thought. But firstly, though it would be just and beautiful to make Ariadne say (like Catullus in 64 55 'necdum etiam sese quae uisit uisere credit') that at her first glimpse of the flying sail she did not know whether it were real or imaginary, I cannot conceive anything much more silly and aimless than to make her say (as the editors do here) that at the time of writing this letter to Theseus she still does not know whether she really saw or only fancied that she saw the sail. And secondly, she proceeds to contradict this notion flatly. When you come to 43 *sqq.* you read '*iamque oculis ereptus eras. tum denique* fleui: | torpuerant molles *ante* dolore genae. | quid potius facerent quam me mea lumina flerent, | *postquam desierant uela uidere tua?*': so she did see the sail, and she knows that she saw it.

As to the meaning and the form of the sentence I feel no doubt at all, but the erasure of P and the divergency of the other MSS make the wording uncertain. It seems clear however that emendation must be based on the *tamquam* of G which is supported against the other MSS by the *uam* of P. Therefore I conjecture

ut uidi, *haut dignam* quae me uidisse putarem,
frigidior glacie semianimisque fui.

ut is Bentley's and J. F. Heusinger's: both *ut* and *haut* are eternally confused with *aut*. 'quae' is acc. plur. neut.: the meaning is 'when I saw such a sight as methought I did not deserve to see'. Compare ii 61 'speraui melius, *quia me meruisse putaui*', v 7 *sq.* 'leniter, ex merito quidquid patiare, ferendum est: | *quae uenit indigno poena, dolenda venit*'.

The corruption would begin with the easy change of *gn* to *qu*, *dignam* to *di quam:* indeed [*di q*]*uam* itself, for aught I know, may be under the ///*uam* of P; or perhaps in P *dignam* was corrupted to [*di*]*uam* by that frequent loss of *g* beside *n* which at xxi 216 has transformed *digna* to *bina*. I have also thought of 'ut uidi, *indignam* quae' cet., *indi* being absorbed by *uidi* and leaving only *gnam* or *quam* for the scribes to spin into metre. The *etiam* of certain MSS, as I have said, appears to be interpolated and assuredly was not in P; so let no one conjecture *meritam*. The *fuerant* of V is also very suspicious and discountenanced by P; so I would not suggest *uerum*, i.e. *aequum* 'fair'.

But if you like to assume that another word in the verse is corrupt it will be possible to follow the *aut tamquam* of G very closely indeed:

ut uidi, *haut umquam* quae me *me*ruisse putarem,

or perhaps *hautquaquam* (Verg. georg. iv 455 'hautquaquam ob meritum', where by the way one MS has *aut quamquam* as again at Aen. xii 45). The loss of *me-* after *me* and the expansion of *-ruisse* to *uidisse* are corruptions of which I shall elsewhere give several examples but here only one: vii 55 where Mr. Palmer emends 'urbe uirum *iuui*': *iu* was absorbed by *ui* or *m*, and *ui* was expanded to *uidi* which stands in the MSS. Then for the sense and language compare ii 61 already cited 'speraui melius quia *me meruisse putaui*'.

X 67–75.

Non ego te, Crete centum digesta per urbes,
aspiciam, puero cognita terra Ioui,

ut pater et tellus iusto regnata parenti
prodita sunt facto, nomina cara, meo.
cum tibi, ne uictor tecto morerere recuruo,
quae regerent passus, pro duce fila dedi,
tum mihi dicebas 'per ego ipsa pericula iuro
te fore, dum nostrum uiuet uterque, meam'.
uiuimus, et non sum, Theseu, tua.

Thus should this passage be written and punctuated. The full stop at the end of 70 instead of the usual comma, and the *tum* (from a few MSS) in 73 instead of the usual *cum*, are due to Bentley: these alterations are made in order that the important point contained in 75 may be introduced in a workmanlike and not in a bungling manner. What I have done is to put a comma at the end of 68 instead of the usual full stop, and to write *ut* (= ex quo tempore) in 69 instead of *at*. *at* has no meaning in this place and was altered by Heinsius and Bentley with some MSS to *nam:* the modern editors (except that Mr Ehwald proposes *a*) retain it, because one conjunction is much the same as another.

X 83–86.

Iam iam uenturos aut hac aut suspicor illac,
qui lanient auido uiscera dente, lupos.
forsitan et fuluos tellus alat ista leones.
quis scit an et saeuas tigridas insula habet?

85 *alat* P, *alit* G et plerique.
86 *et saeuas*] *et haec* P, *haec saeuas* G et alii, *hec etiam* V.
tigridas G et alii, *tigrides* (*trigides*) P, V, alii.
habet] *habent* P, sed corr.

I do not think that I can emend verse 86, but I think that I can remove one obstacle to its emendation. The conjectures hitherto proposed either retain 'quis scit an...habet' and are solecistic, or alter it and are violent. The best attempt yet made to correct the grammar is Wakker's, who transposes *habet* with the *alat* of 85. But a much easier transposition will achieve the desired result. Suppose the couplet once stood thus:

quis sc*it an et* fuluos tellus alat ista leones?
fors*itan et* saeuas tigridas insula habet.

It will be seen that *itanet* occurs in the first verse immediately above *itanet* in the second. I suggest then that the scribe at that point wandered from the hexameter into the pentameter and wrote

quis scit an et | saeuas tigridas insula habet...

then saw what he had done, and added the lacking members

forsitan et | fuluos tellus alat ista leones...

and then appended marks of transposition. But the next scribe, finding a pentameter before an hexameter, concluded that he was to transpose these; and accordingly produced our present text.

I only profess to have mended the grammar: there is much more to mend. *saeuas* is very uncertain, and the elision *insula habet* is not to be defended by *resistere equos* penned at Tomi and taken straight from Propertius. I make no further proposal of my own, but I will say that the best among the various conjectures, now that it will no longer be solecistic, seems to me to be Gronovius' *saeuam tigrida Naxos habet.*

X 145, 146.

Has tibi plangendo lugubria pectora lassas
infelix tendo trans freta longa manus.

These two lines and the two which follow them are properly expelled by Bentley as spurious; but still one need not be too proud to emend them. *longa* in the pentameter is omitted by P, which probably means that the original ran

infelix tendo trans freta *lata* manus.

The scribe glanced from *ta* to *ta:* at ii 122 'aequora lata' a similar error has caused *lata* to be lost and supplanted by *nota* in G. 'freta lata' is found at met. xi 749: 'freta longa' is much commoner, her. vii 46, xiv 103, xvi 22, am. ii 11 5, met. vii 67, viii 142, fast. iii 868, v 660, and therefore likely to occur to a corrector.

XI 121—128.

Tu tamen, o frustra miserae sperate sorori,

sparsa, precor, nati collige membra tui,
et refer ad matrem socioque inpone sepulchro,
urnaque nos habeat quamlibet arta duos.
uiue memor nostri lacrimasque in uulnera funde
neue reformida corpus amantis amans.
tu, rogo, dilectae nimium mandata sororis
perfer: mandatis persequar ipsa patris.

In the last distich the words *tu...perfer* can only be explained as addressed to a servant who is to carry Canace's letter to Macareus: 'do you *convey*' etc.: *perfer* means nothing else. But this is out of the question, and Hor. serm. i 10 92 and Prop. iii 23 23 *sq.* are no parallels at all: such an address cannot form a part of Canace's epistle. Nor indeed is *tu* intelligible without a vocative, when *tu* in 121 means Macareus. Then further, the words *mandatis persequar* are neither sense nor Latin: in G and many other MSS they are altered into *mandatis perfruar*, which is grammatical but laughable: a few MSS try another road and write *mandatum persequar*, which is better but very bad: the singular *mandatum* after the plural *mandata* is most incompetent writing, and the corruption into *-is* of the acc. termination *-um* by the side of a transitive verb is nothing less than inexplicable. Heinsius accordingly judged the couplet spurious; but he despaired too soon.

To begin with, the first sentence is excellently emended in one MS, quoted by Heinsius himself, which alters *perfer* to *perfice*. The words are then addressed, as they should be, to Macareus, and make perfect sense: for the corruption compare xiii 122 where *refecta* has been changed to *referre*, and Livy xlv 28 10 there adduced by Madvig where *refici* has been changed to *referri*. I propose to complete the emendation thus:

tu, rogo, dilectae nimium mandata sororis
perfice: mandatis *opsequar* ipsa patris.

Some accident obliterated *o*, and *psequar* was mistaken for *ꝑsequar*.

A. E. Housman.

(*To be continued.*)

OF TWO PASSAGES IN HOMER.

In commenting on Eurip. *Alc.* 64–69 I have called attention to the rhetorical inversion of cause and effect in these verses and also to the close parallel to be found in Aesch. *Prom.* 918–923,—a parallel that extends even to the expansion of the τοῖος sentence by a ὃς δὴ sentence. Of course, however, the postponement of the τοῖος clause is the essential common factor. In a note on *Alc.* 332 *sq.* the same principle of arrangement is appealed to in defence of the traditional text (barring ἄλλως in v. 333, which should perhaps be changed, with Wakefield, to ἄλλων). Here οὕτως with an adjective is equal to a specific τοῖος (τοία). This defence was, I still think (with all due respect to Mr. Hadley), sound. But it is not my object at present to discuss the instances of this form of sentence in the *Alcestis*, or in the Tragedians at large (cf., however, for Sophocles *Ai.* 560–563), but to deal with earlier examples of it.

A parallel to the first two passages cited above (*Alc.* 64–69, *Prom.* 918–923) is to be found in Hom. Δ 387–390:—

ἔνθ' οὐδὲ ξεῖνός περ ἐὼν ἱππηλάτα Τυδεὺς
τάρβει, μοῦνος ἐὼν πολέσιν μετὰ Καδμείοισιν,
ἀλλ' ὅ γ' ἀεθλεύειν προκαλίζετο, πάντα δ' ἐνίκα
ῥηιδίως· τοίη οἱ ἐπίρροθος ἦεν Ἀθήνη·

The parallel would be complete in extenso, if the last verse were followed by a relative clause beginning with ἥ δὴ (e.g. ἥ δή οἱ μέγα θάρσος ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ἐνῆκεν). With Δ 389–90 we may compare E 807–8, even if v. 808 be an interpolation. E 826–8 has the former sentence in the imperative, but the τοῖος clause is like (indeed, is nearly identical with) that in E 808 and that in Δ 390. (With E 826–8 we may compare Ξ 342 *sq.* and O 254.) In all these passages we have

a form of the qualitative τοῖος, and we may find another case, or rather, perhaps, an extension, of this at δ 227 (cf. Eur. *Med.* 718 and 789), if we lighten the pointing at the close of v. 226. Similar to this last is the use of the quantitative τόσος in ι 243. Other (and better) instances of forms of τόσος in the type of sentence we are considering are: ξ 326, τ 295, E 863, I 546. The demonstrative adverb οὕτω, without a following adjective, appears similarly used at ι 262. The absence of the adjective differentiates (though not essentially) this example from *Alc.* 332 *sq.*

We come now to the passage that prompted the writing of this note—A 418. According to the traditional text Thetis says to Achilles (v. 414 *sqq.*):—

ὤ μοι, τέκνον ἐμόν, τί νύ σ' ἔτρεφον αἰνὰ τεκοῦσα;
αἴθ' ὄφελες παρὰ νηυσὶν ἀδάκρυτος καὶ ἀπήμων
ἧσθαι, ἐπεί νυ τοι αἶσα μίννυθά περ, οὔ τι μάλα δήν,
νῦν δ' ἅμα τ' ὠκύμορος καὶ ὀιζυρὸς περὶ πάντων
ἔπλεο· τῶ (or τῶι) σε κακῆι αἴσηι τέκον ἐν μεγάροισιν.

But '*therefore* ill-starred did I bring thee forth in the hall' is not what we expect here, and I have for some time believed a slight change in the text (really only an interpretation of the MS. tradition) to be necessary. Write τῶς σε κακῆι αἴσηι τέκον ἐν μεγάροισιν, and we have an instance of the form of expression we have been discussing: 'So ill-starred did I bear thee in the hall' (= οὕτω σε κτέ.).

This seems to be the only case in Homer where τῶς has given place to τῶ (τῶι): but, if we examine the few passages in which τῶς appears (we may well think, with van Leeuwen, that it was once more frequent), we shall find one that should, it seems, by a trifling transposition be reduced to the type of sentence we are dealing with. In τ 232 *sqq.* we read:—

τὸν δὲ χιτῶν' ἐνόησα περὶ χροὶ σιγαλόεντα,
οἷόν τε κρομύοιο λοπὸν κάτα ἰσχαλέοιο,
τῶς μὲν ἔην μαλακός, λαμπρὸς δ' ἦν ἠέλιος ὥς·
ἦ μὲν πολλαί γ' αὐτὸν ἐθηήσαντο γυναῖκες.

Here the οἷον clause is explanatory of σιγαλόεντα. The τῶς sentence immediately following, with its μαλακός, which is not in point after ἰσχαλέοιο, and its λαμπρὸς ἠέλιος ὥς, which makes a homely comparison ridiculous by contrast, is, furthermore, awkwardly and unusually connected with v. 235. We have only to reverse the order of vv. 234 and 235 (the present order is easily to be explained by a careless reader's ready connection of τῶς with οἷον and by the similar position of μὲν in the two verses) to have the arrangement that is normal in such sentences, as well as a greatly improved sense,—indeed, I would fain believe, the original form of the passage. Thus we shall read:—

τὸν δὲ χιτῶν' κτέ.
ἦ μὲν πολλαί γ' αὐτὸν ἐθηήσαντο γυναῖκες·
τῶς μὲν ἔην μαλακός, λαμπρὸς δ' ἦν ἠέλιος ὥς.

There is a passage in Aeschylus (*Prom.* 907 *sqq.*) that belongs with those discussed above, and should be read thus:—

ἦ μὴν ἔτι Ζεὺς, καίπερ αὐθάδη φρονῶν,
ἔσται ταπεινός· τοῖον ἐξαρτύεται κτέ.

Faith in the text of the Mediceus has led scholars, since Hermann, to reject the vulgate for αὐθάδης φρενῶν in v. 907 (though that does not so much concern us now) and to cling to οἷον where τοῖον is clearly demanded, as Robortello long ago saw.

Mortimer Lamson Earle.

Bryn Mawr College.

NOTE ON *OD.* IV. 544–7.

ἀλλὰ τάχιστα
πείρα, ὅπως κεν δὴ σὴν πατρίδα γαῖαν ἵκηαι·
ἦ γάρ μιν ζωόν γε κιχήσεαι, ἤ κεν Ὀρέστης
κτεῖνεν ὑποφθάμενος, σὺ δέ κεν τάφου ἀντιβολήσαις.

All MSS. and Herodian read ἤ κεν: in the next line the Medicean (G, saec. x.) has κτείναι, the Florentine (F, saec. xi.) has κτεῖνεν, and the Palatine (P, 1201 A.D.) has κτάνεν, corrected to κτεῖνεν by a later hand,

and to κτείνει by a still later (Molhuysen, De tribus Homeri Odysseae codicibus antiquissimis p. 50). Modern critics accept κτεῖνεν, but many read καὶ instead of κεν. But neither ἤ κεν...κτεῖνεν nor ἢ καὶ...κτ. is satisfactory, and we must either accept κτείναι from G, or make the very slight alteration to κτείνει = κτείνῃ, 3. sg. aor. subj.

The words quoted are addressed by Proteus to Menelaus, who has to return to Egypt and there sacrifice, before he can set out on the homeward voyage to Argos. All this involves so much time, that if Aegisthus were already dead, Menelaus could not possibly arrive in time for the τάφος. Accordingly the translation of Butcher and Lang, 'or it may be Orestes was beforehand with thee and slew him', is objectionable in point of meaning, even if the meaning could be got out of the Greek. But it cannot, for ἤ κεν...κτεῖνεν can only mean 'or else O. would have slain him, but did not;' it can only give the supposed consequence of an unfulfilled condition. Monro, *H.G.*² p. 295, compares X 108-110:

ἐμοὶ δὲ τότ' ἂν πολὺ κέρδιον εἴη
ἄντην ἢ Ἀχιλῆα κατακτείναντα νέεσθαι
ἠέ κεν αὐτῷ ὀλέσθαι ἐυκλειῶς πρὸ πόληος.

But this is very different, for the infinitive is equivalent to a clause with εἰ and optative:—ἐμοὶ ἂν κέρδιον εἴη, ἢ εἰ Ἀχιλῆα κατακτείνας νεοίμην, ἠὲ εἴ κεν (κεν emphasizes the alternative) αὐτὸς ὀλοίμην. For εἴ κεν with the optative we can find Homeric parallels, *e.g.* I 14 (cf. Monro, *H.G.*² p. 285), but none for κεν with the aorist indicative in the sense proposed.

Another interpretation makes a future perfect of the aorist with κεν, vide Merry *ad loc.* ('O. will have been his slayer'); which gives good sense, but bad grammar.

On the other hand ἢ καὶ...κτεῖνεν is good in grammar, but, for the reason stated, bad in sense. We must have a verbal form that refers to future time.

The readiest solution is presented by the aor. opt. κτείναι in G: 'either you will find him alive, or Orestes might be beforehand with you and kill him, while you would come in for the funeral-feast.' But we can more easily explain the variations in the MS. reading, if we suppose that the original was κτείνει, 3rd sg. aor. subj., with -ει corresponding to -ομεν, -ετε in the plural of subjunctives from non-thematic indicatives: cf. Schulze, *Hermes* xx. 493 and *K.Z.* xxxiii. 134, and Stolz, *Ind. Forsch.* ii. 154. For the construction cf. Λ 431-3:

σήμερον ἢ δοιοῖσιν ἐπεύξεαι Ἱππασίδῃσι
. . . . . .
ἤ κεν ἐμῷ ὑπὸ δουρὶ τυπεὶς ἀπὸ θυμὸν ὀλέσσῃς.

C. M. Mulvany.

NOTE ON CICERO, *AD FAM.* 1, 2, 2 AND 1, 1, 2.

In the March number of the *Classical Review*, p. 108, Mr. Gretton has discussed some of the many difficulties involved in the information which has come down to us concerning the debates in the Roman senate early in the year 56 B.C., on the proposed restoration of Ptolemaeus Auletes to his kingdom. Mr. Gretton's remarks bear chiefly upon Cic. *Ad Fam.* 1, 2, 2: 'proxima erat Hortensi sententia, cum Lupus, tribunus plebis, quod ipse de Pompeio retulisset, intendere coepit ante se oportere discessionem facere quam consules. Eius orationi uehementer ab omnibus reclamatum est; erat enim et iniqua et noua. Consules neque concedebant neque ualde repugnabant, diem consumi uolebant, quod est factum; perspiciebant enim in Hortensi sententiam multis partibus pluris ituros, quamquam aperte Volcacio adsentirentur. Multi rogabantur, atque id ipsum consulibus inuitis, nam ei Bibuli sententiam ualere cupierunt.' In this passage the two most recent editors, Mendelssohn and C. F.W. Mueller, keep the reading of the MSS., *inuitis*, whereas most of their predecessors insert *non* before the word. Mr. Gretton also supports the traditional text but from a different point of view; they refer *ei* to the consuls, he to *multi*. I will discuss the former view first, but must begin by mentioning that the two editors follow Madvig in changing *cupierunt* to *cupierant*. No necessity exists for this alteration; Cicero may just as well have written that the consuls *did*, earlier in the debate, favour the rejected motion of Bibulus, as that they *had* favoured it. Apart from that matter, the lection of the *codices* gives a curious succession of considerations in the minds of the consuls: (1) they saw that the

motion of Hortensus would be carried, if the matter came to a division; (2) they therefore wished the sitting to pass without result; (3) though much time was wasted by asking for opinions, this waste of time did not make them happy, because the motion of Bibulus which they favoured had been rejected. To enumerate the succession of considerations is to condemn this interpretation of the passage. The consuls wanted to waste time, but they were sorry for the waste, because their favourite motion had just been rejected!

Mr. Gretton refers *ei* to *multi*; and rightly says that it is of some importance to make out the view which the two consuls, Lentulus Marcellinus and Marcius Philippus, took of the matter. But he makes no reference to a very important passage in the preceding letter, viz. *Fam.* 1, 1, 2: 'Marcellinum tibi esse iratum scis: is hac regia causa excepta ceteris in rebus acerrimum tui defensorem fore ostendit. Quod dat, accipimus: quod instituit referre de religione et saepe iam retulit, ab eo deduci non potest.' Putting aside for the present the question whether *tibi* in this passage is corrupt or not, we may fairly deduce from it two inferences, (1) that throughout the contest Marcellinus opposed the claims of Cicero's correspondent, Lentulus Spinther; (2) that in persistently pressing upon the attention of the senate what Cicero calls the *religionis calumnia*, he desired to injure the prospects, not only of Spinther, but of Pompeius also. The latter inference is confirmed by a passage in the preceding section of the letter; 'regis causa si qui sunt qui uelint, qui pauci sunt, omnes rem ad Pompeium deferri uolunt, senatus religionis calumniam non religione, sed maleuolentia et illius regiae largitionis inuidia comprobat.' We may reasonably conclude that Marcellinus, at all events, (in his heart) cried a plague upon both houses, that of Spinther and that of Pompeius alike. He owed much to Pompeius, a fact of which Pompeius bitterly reminded him later in the year (Plut. *Pomp.* 51). He would be unwilling to oppose directly the friends of Pompeius in the senate, but would be glad to check the ambition of his former leader by indirect methods. These could lead to no open breach with Pompeius, because the triumvir himself was playing a double game. While his friends in the senate were pushing his claims, he was pretending, in conversation with Cicero, that he was devoted to the interests of Spinther. The majority in the senate were acting much in the same manner as Marcellinus; they were ready to support by speech the motion of Volcacius, while determined, if a division were taken, to vote for that of Hortensius. As to the other consul, Marcius Philippus, there is nothing to show that he diverged from his colleague; the evidence is all the other way.

Mr. Gretton sees how difficult it is to refer *ei* to *multi* unless the latter word be restricted to the *consulares*, who mostly voted for the proposal of Bibulus which was lost. But the restriction is unnatural. As the very purpose of questioning the senators was to waste time, the questioning would obviously be pushed as far as possible. On the other hand if *multi* goes far beyond the *consulares* we have a most extraordinary change of front. Just before, in the very same sitting, the proposition of Bibulus had been rejected by a large majority (*frequentes ierunt in alia omnia*). Then, we are told, the consuls clearly saw (*perspiciebant*) that a large majority would be ready to speak for the motion of Volcacius, but would be sure to vote for that of Hortensius. Yet the *multi*, when asked for their opinion, spoke in favour of the already rejected motion! The insertion of *non* seems to educe order out of chaos. The fact that the consuls previously desired the resolution of Bibulus to pass was very good reason why they should now be glad to see time wasted. That resolution, leading up to *tris legatos ex eis qui priuati sunt* (*Fam.* 1, 1, 3) shut the door *permanently* against Spinther and Pompeius alike. The policy of delay was sure to shut the door against both, *temporarily*, and was likely to shut the door finally; and so matters indeed turned out. The reading *non inuitis* seems, further, to fit in very well with the fact that the demand for *sententiae* proceeded from the tribune in the first instance. In ordinary circumstances, the consuls would not care to be obliged to conduct the business of the house according to the views of a tribune. The words *id ipsum* seem also to be somewhat in favour of reading *non inuitis*; they appear most naturally to refer to the *perrogatio*, to the *fact* that many were called upon to speak (τὸ *rogari multos*). On the view of Mr. Gretton, they less naturally emphasize the contrast between the expectation which the consuls formed of the *perrogatio*, and its actual result. The circumstance that *non* is not in the MSS. has little weight if any. In his note, Mueller gives a number of examples of *non* omitted, and his list might be increased indefinitely.

Incidentally, it may be noted that the passage in *Fam.* 1, 2, 2 makes rather in

favour of the view put forward by Willems, and rejected by Mommsen, that the *relator* could stop the *perrogatio* at any point, and proceed to a division, could in fact enforce the closure of debate. The *relator* could certainly call for a division without debate. According to Mommsen's opinion, if he asked for speeches at all, he was bound to give every senator who had the right to speak, a chance of delivering himself. In that case it is hard to see any pertinence in Cicero's statement that *many* were asked to speak. It is just conceivable but not at all likely, that on the occasion of which Cicero writes, members were pressed to explain themselves at length, instead of giving a mere brief assent to some preceding speaker. Cicero would surely in such circumstances have added something to the ordinary word *rogabantur*. The supposition that the consuls had a power of closing debate is consonant with the fact that they could exclude debate altogether, and also with the old theory, never entirely put out of sight, that the senators were persons whose advice the consuls might ask or not, as they pleased.

I now return to the words in *Fam.* 1, 1, 2: 'Marcellinum tibi esse iratum scis.' Many scholars have been captivated by the brilliant correction *tibicini*, due to an old and unknown scholar. Another conjecture which has found favour is *regi* for *tibi*. Prof. Tyrrell somewhat confidently pronounces that either *tibi* or *iratum* is corrupt. With equal confidence Mendelssohn rejects the idea of corruption; while C. F. W. Mueller accepts the MSS. reading without comment. Prof. Tyrrell urges that we know of no reason why Marcellinus, especially, should have been angry with Spinther. It is not, however, necessary to look for a cause of offence special to Marcellinus. The cause may have been of a general and political character. Clearly Spinther had offended many senators. I would explain by this fact the words in *Ad. Qu. Frat.* 2, 2, 3 (otherwise interpreted by Prof. Tyrrell): sine dubio res a Lentulo remota uidetur esse, cum magno meo dolore; quamquam multa fecit quare, si fas esset, iure ei suscensere possemus.' There seems to me to be no probability in the supposition that Cicero is here referring solely to his own affairs. He often eulogizes Spinther as the warmest of his supporters, and it is hardly possible that this champion should have done *many things* which might afford his friend private reason for anger. It is true that Spinther had in 57, as consul, joined his colleague in considering, with the aid of a *consilium*, the monetary compensation which Cicero should receive for the destruction of his property while he was in exile, and that the compensation awarded seemed to Cicero inadequate. But he nowhere lays the blame on Spinther, and could even in public praise the compensation as generous. In the letter to Quintus, 2, 2, 3, Cicero speaks of the policy of obstruction in the Egyptian business as having been carried out *per obtrectatores Lentuli*. The phrase hits Marcellinus hard. If we read *tibi* in *Fam.* 1, 1, 2, the real difficulty seems to lie in the sudden transition from the statement that Marcellinus is angry with Spinther, to the statement that he will be the friend of Spinther in all matters which have not to do with the Alexandrine prince. If *tibi* be correct, as I think it is, some adversative particle, such as *tamen*, must have fallen out between *is* and *hac*.

J. S. Reid.

DISCOVERY OF A COLLATION OF THE 'CODEX TURNEBI' OF PLAUTUS.

II.

In this article I propose to put together the chief contributions of the newly found collation to our knowledge of the text, and to submit to students of Plautus for their consideration some of the more interesting problems which it suggests. It will be well to begin with a short account of the MSS. hitherto known.

The last twelve plays of Plautus (*Bacch.-Truc.*) were unknown to scholars at the Revival of Learning, until the 'Codex Ursinianus' (*D*) was discovered. It is now in the Vatican Library, a MS. of the 11th century. In the middle of the 16th century Camerarius brought two other MSS. to light, one of the 10th century (*B*, now in the Vatican Library), and another of the 11th (*C*, now at Heidelberg). These three MSS. *BCD* are closely connected, all coming from one original, which seems to have been

a minuscule MS., perhaps of the 9th century. There are indications that this 9th century (?) original was the immediate copy of an Archetype written in capitals, and so presumably of a date not later than the 5th century. The text of this Archetype is known as the 'Palatine' text, and our three existing MSS. are referred to the 'Palatine' family.

The discovery of the Ambrosian Palimpsest (*A*) of Milan, a fourth century MS. written in capitals, gave us a rival text, the 'Ambrosian' text, as it is called. Had the whole of the plays been preserved in *A*, there would be few lines of Plautus left with doubtful reading. But unfortunately all that we have is a mere fragment, and the letters are often quite illegible. Still the discovery has shewn us clearly the conditions of the problem of the Plautine text. What the textual critic has to do is to eliminate from *BCD* the errors of that common original from which they are all derived, and get back to the old 'Palatine' text of the ancient Archetype.

Of these three 'Palatine' MSS. *BCD*, two, namely *C* and *D*, are copied from a single MS. and reproduce its errors, here omitting a word or a line, there substituting a wrong word for the right one, and so on. *B*, which is a much more faithful copy of the 9th century (?) original than this MS. was, enables us to discover and correct these errors. Where *B* disagrees with *CD*, we can generally assure ourselves that the *B*-reading was the reading of the common original, while the *CD* reading is a mere corruption, due to the writer of that MS. of which *C* and *D* are immediate copies. But where *B* agrees with *CD*, the reading must be the reading of their common original. To eliminate the errors of this MS., supposed to have been a MS. of the 9th century, we need some new codex which shall act as a check on *BCD* in the same way that *B* acts as a check on *CD*.

The French scholar Adrien Turnèbe seems to have made use of a codex which fulfilled these conditions. The few, provokingly few, readings which he quotes from it in his *Adversaria* (published in 1564), shew us that it contained words and lines which had been omitted in the common original of *BCD*, while it preserved in their true form words which had been miscopied in that original. In a passage of the *Poenulus*, for example, where the Carthaginian appears on the stage, *BCD* exhibit a defective line (v. 977):

facies quidem edepol—

But Turnebus quotes from his MS. the full line:

facies quidem edepol Punica est: guggast homo;

and when the Ambrosian Palimpsest was discovered in this century, it was found to exhibit the line in this full form. The cause of error in *BCD* is plain. The monk who wrote out their common original was puzzled, as he might well be, by the strange ending of the line, and left a blank to be supplied by the 'corrector,' the senior who supervised the copyists' work in the Scriptorium. The remissness of the 'corrector' left the blank unfilled. Further on in the same passage (v. 1033) *BCD* agree in the corrupt reading *micdilia*. Turnebus however quotes from his MS. *micdilix*, and the Ambrosian Palimpsest confirms this with its *migdilix*:

qui huc aduenisti nos captatum, migdilix.

In capital script X and A are often confused; so we may suppose that the scribe of the common original of *BCD* miscopied the MICDILIX of his original as *micdilia*. In default of the Palimpsest, we should have had no MS. authority to enable us to detect this error, had it not been for Turnebus' mention of the reading of his codex.

From the scanty particulars which Turnebus has communicated, it appeared that his codex, while derived from the 'Palatine' Archetype, was not derived from that 9th century (?) MS., which was the common original of *BCD*. In other words, it stood to *B* and to this original in the same relation as *B* stands to *C* and to *D*; and so would supply us with the needed check on *BCD* in the same way that *B* supplies us with a check on *CD*.

It is this 'codex Turnebi' of which a collation has been discovered on the margins of a Gryphius edition of Plautus in the Bodleian Library. The collation contains the supplement of many lines which shew a lacuna in *BCD*. Sometimes the missing words were already known to us from the quotation of Turnebus himself. Thus the marginal variant for *Poen.* 977 is *Punicust guggast homo*, which (with the correction *Punicast*) is precisely the reading of *A*. Sometimes they had been supplied by Lambinus or Scaliger, who both seem to have had access to a collation (perhaps this actual Bodleian copy) of the 'codex Turnebi.'

Sometimes they had remained unknown till the discovery of the Ambrosian Palimpsest. Here is a list of those that are now first brought to light by this collation. I give in each case the reading of *B*, then in brackets the supplements furnished by the newly found collation :

Pers. 35

—— cum tibi me potis es sempiternum (*B*)

(Emere amicum tibi me potis es sempiternum). This variant is preceded by the words 'et ego.'

52

Usque ero domi, dum excoxero lenoni malam

(lenoni malam rem aliquam).

205

P. Sophoclidisca, di me amabunt. S. Quid me? utrum hercle

(quid me. P. utrum hercle illis iubet). Read *lubet.*

239

P. Quid est quod metuas? S. Idem istuc quod tu. P. Di<c> ergo

(more n. P. dic ergo S. at uotita sum). This *more n*, if I have deciphered it rightly, suggests *mora* 'delay.' Lambinus supplied *at vetita sum* from his 'libri veteres.'

623 —— habet cor

(Nec dolens habet cor). Read with the Palimpsest *Ut sapiens habet cor.*

856–7 conuenisse te Toxilum me
spectatores, bene ualete, leno periit ;
plaudite

(te Toxilum mi spectatores). The new reading suggests that there is no lacuna before 'spectatores' and that 'me' of *BCD* is a corruption of *mi*, or as I should prefer to spell the word, *mei ;* cf. *Cist.* 678 mi homines, mi spectatores.

Rud. 166 Neque gubernator umquam potuit (unquam potuit tam bene).

185 *sqq.*

Nimio hominum fortunae minus miserae memorantur
—— experiundo iis datur acerbum
—— hoc deo complacitum est me hoc ornatu ornatam
In incertas regiones timidam eiectam.
Hancine ego ad rem natam miseram memorabo?
Hancine ego partem capio ob pietatem praecipuam?

(Quam in uisu experiundo...timidam eiectam Hanccine ego ad rem natam miseram me memorabo hanccine ego partem). I would supply *Satin* at the beginning of v. 187 and suppose *eire* to have dropped out before *eiectam* and *ego* to have been wrongly inserted after *hancine* (v. 190).

311 *sqq.*

Famelica hominum natio : quid agitis, ut peritis?
Ut piscatorem aequum est fame sitique speque
Ecquem adulescentem huc dum hic astatis
Strenua facie rubicundum fortem qui tres
Duceret c<h>lam*y*datos cum machaer[i]is uidisti seni

(spesque falsa Ecquem adulescentem huc dum (?) hic astatis expedite...qui tres semihomines...(uidistis) uenientem). Lambinus from his 'veteres libri' cited 'astatis expedite' and 'qui tres semihomines.' I think that the words *uidistis eire* (?) were 'overflow' words of the third line in the Archetype, and would read : *astatis, expedite,* | *Vidistis eire strenua* etc. with the substitution of *secum* for *semi. Secum* and *eire* have already been proposed.

457

Confugiam hu[i]c : ita res suppetit subit

(Confugiam huc. ita me suppetit subita ueniam).

481

Heus—si, Ptolem[c]ogratia, cape hanc urnam tibi

(Heus agasi ptolemogratia). This looks like a second proper name, *Agasius.* If it is, *Agasi Ptolemocratia* may be a phrase like Virgil's *Hectoris Andromache* or *Deiphobe Glauci.*

647 *sqq.* Lambinus' supplement of *plenissimus* (v. 651) is confirmed by the Oxford marginalia, but not his *paucis expedi* (v. 650). The Oxford variant for v. 650 is 'T. uis' which suggests *T. uis dicam tibi?*

664 *sqq.*

Nunc id est cum omnium copiarum atque opum

Auxili[i] praesidi[i] uiduitas nos tenet.
—— cuiast quae salutem afferat
—— artem ingredi persequamur
—— in metu nunc sumus ambae
—— importunitas tantaque iniuria
—— nos est modo hic intus ab nostro hero
—— scelestu<s> sacerdotem anum praecipes
Reppulit, propulit perquam indignis modis.

(Senec uias...Sciamus tanto...in iniuria Orta in...praecipes. The Gryphius reading 'Qui sacram scelestus' has been altered to 'Qui scelestus'). I would read in v. 660 *Nec salus(t ?) nec uiast quae salutem afferat.* For v. 667 *Nec quam in partem* has been proposed, and for v. 668 *Scimus: tanto in metu.* For v. 671 Turnebus quotes from his MS. *quin scelestus.* Leo's theory of *(e)st* would preclude the possibility of *salust* for *salus est* (*Plaut. Forsch.* p. 255).

686 edepol—hunc acerbum
(diem hunc).

687

T. Bonum animum habete. P. Nam, obsecro, unde—mus mihi inuenitur ?
(unde istec animus mihi inuenitur). *Unde iste animus* has been already proposed.

697 *sqq.*

Illos scelestos qui tuum fecerunt fanum parui
—— arenosque ut han<c> tua pace aram obsidere
—— aut hae ambae sumus opera Neptunei noctu
——habeas, neue idcirco nobis uicio uortas.

(Scire nosque ut hanc tua pace aram obsidere...aut ae ambae sumus opera Neptuni noctu Indignum id habeas neue idcirco nobis uicio uertas). Before the words 'Scire...obsidere' stands what I suppose to be the variant of the inferior MS.: 'Are nosque ut hanc tua pace aram obsedere.' After them comes 'app(aret) versum ita legendum ac aedendum. Ulciscare nosque ut hanc tua pace aram obsidere.' At the end comes a note to the effect that a 'lacuna grandiuscula' was to be seen before the words 'ae ambae' and that 'deest' was written in the margin. Then 'fort. pro "aut ambae" "eiectae ambae" sumus'). I suspect the *scire* to be a scribe's conjectural emendation of the imperfect word which began the line in the Archetype, SCARE. We have already had a similar case in *Pers.* 623 where, I fancy, the Archetype, had merely IENSKA. BETCOR.

712 *sq.*

Meas mihi ancillas inuito me eripis——
De senatu Cyrenensi quemuis opulentum—

(Meas mihi ancillas inuito me eripis. L. habe inniceus (?) de senatu Cyrenensi quis (*leg.* quemuis) opulentum uirum). This is followed by the note 'app(arenter) "habe indicem.(?)"' The ending of v. 713 can be read in the Palimpsest, but the letters at the end of the preceding line are illegible. Read *habe iudicem* (cf. v. 1380).

To enumerate all the new readings supplied by the Oxford marginalia would take too much space. I must confine myself to selecting some that have either never been proposed or at least have not found favour in the last editions. The *B*-reading is placed first and the new reading follows in brackets :—

Poen. 266.

Prosedas, pistorum amicas, reliquias al[l]icarias.
(reginas allicarias.)

504

Ita me di ament tardo amico nihil[i] est quicquam inequius.

(nequius). *Nequius* makes alliteration. Cf. *Bacch.* 651 nequius nil est quam egens consili seruos.

Rud. 727.

D. Hae autem Veneri complacuerunt habeat si argentum dabit.

(Si autem uenit etc.). This note follows : 'eadem persona lenon(is) loquente.' The Palimpsest seems to begin the line with *Si.*

Pseud. 1272 *sqq.*

Corde atque animo suo opsequentes, sed post
Quam exurrexi, orant me[i]d ut saltem.
Ad hunc me modum intulit illis satis facete nime ex disciplina.
(illis satisfacerem me). This note follows : 'fort(asse) intulit ut illis.'

Poen. 586.

Hodie iuris coctiores non sunt, qui lites creant.

(hodie iuris cretiores). I am not quite sure of the second and third letters of the

last word (? cro-, cre-). Turnebus *Adv.* xv. 7 supports the reading *coctiores* (*BCD*).

1075

Ostende: inspici[i]am: aperi, audi: atque ades.

(Ostende inspiciam aperi audi atque audes). The last word is not written immediately after *atque* but in the next line under *audi*, so may conceivably have been meant for a correction of *audi*. In any case it suggests what I think is the true reading: *aperi—audes?—atque adest* 'open it—will you? There it is!' with *audes* in the sense of *si audes* or *sodes*.

Scarcely less important are the cases where the new collation confirms the reading of some one MS. or group of MSS. It shews, for example, that the reading of *BCD* in that puzzling line, *Poen.* 1168, was also the reading of the 'Palatine' archetype:

Thraecae sunt caelum ne sustolli soleni

(Threcae sunt celumnae sustolli solem). The last word may be 'solent' or possibly 'soleni.' The true reading is no doubt *solent;* but what are we to make of the rest of the line? The 'Palatine' reading is confirmed by the Palimpsest which seems to read something like TKRACAESVNTincelONEM (by the small type I indicate the most doubtful letters). Surely there is a reference to the mares of Diomedes. The Palimpsest reading clearly suggests the word κήλων.

In *Poen.* 1036 the word *tu* in the Gryphius text is expunged, but there is no indication whether this variant comes from the 'codex Turnebi' or from the inferior MS. The Palimpsest also omits *tu*, requiring the scansion *hūic* (cf. Leo ad *Amph.* 702):

Maledicere huic temperabis, si sapis.

The Palimpsest reading is again confirmed in *Poen.* 1237: *Ite si itis*, to be scanned *It(e) si ītis.*

In *Rud.* 745 *B* offers:

Argentum ego pro istisce ambabus cuiae erant domino dedi.

CD omit *ego*. Neither the metre nor the sense is affected by the presence or absence of the word; but the new collation helps us out of the difficulty by confirming the reading of *B*.

Anything that brings us nearer to the actual text of the ancient 'Palatine' Archetype is likely to increase our knowledge of the way in which a Roman play was divided into scenes and the cantica or choruses into lines in ancient editions. In the immediate original of *BCD* the short lines of a Canticum were written together in one long line for the sake of economizing space, and in various ways the genuine division of the lines was abandoned. The new collation gives us here and there useful hints for the re-arrangement of Cantica, by indicating that this or that word should begin the line. It also retains several scene-headings in their original form, with the indication of whether the scene was a dialogue (diverbium) or a musical scene (canticum). For example, the scene-heading of *Pseud.* IV. ii. BALLIO IDEM, had in the 'codex Turnebi' the sign C, *i.e.* 'canticum,' a sign which was not understood by the writer (Turnebus?) of the marginal note accompanying this variant: 'fort(asse) "idem collocutores" vult.' Prof. Klotz's theory that scenes in Iambic Septenarii, and even, on occasion, scenes in Iambic Senarii, might be musical scenes is confirmed by the scene-headings preserved in the new collation. For instance, both *Pers.* II. v. (Iamb. Sept.) and *Pers.* IV. vi. (Iamb. Sen.) have the sign *C*. We learn, too, for the first time, that the 'codex Turnebi,' and presumably the 'Palatine' Archetype, had in the last line of the *Poenulus* and the *Persa* the Greek omega-sign, ω, before the word *plaudite*. In the *Persa* it seems to have been accompanied by the word *pantes* (whence the *pantio* of *BCD*), to judge from Turnebus' (?) note in the margin of the Bodleian Gryphius:—

'pantes D(ua)r. plaudite. pariter ω vero chor(um)loquenti (*sic*) s(ignifi)cat ut fine praecedentis comoediae curemus ω plaudite.'"

For the Carthaginian passage in the *Poenulus* we have a large number of variants, which, it is to be hoped, come from the 'codex Turnebi' and not from the inferior MS. It remains to be seen whether they will bring Semitic scholars any nearer to the interpretation of that interesting relic of a lost language.

When a new MS. is discovered, there is always a temptation to make too much of its readings. I will conclude this article with an example of a variant, which I think belongs to the 'codex Turnebi,' and is palpably wrong.' In *Poen.* 926 the 'Palatine' Archetype had *hoc nocte consulendum.* The Oxford marginalia offer *hoc noctu.* But the Palimpsest shows us the true reading, *hoc docte.*

[Note.—A full list of the more interesting variants preserved in the Oxford marginalia will be found in the (*Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, Nos. 22 sqq.]

W. M. Lindsay.

THE GRANT OF IMMUNITAS TO BRUNDISIUM.

According to Appian, Sulla on landing in Italy in B.C. 83 was received by the inhabitants of Brundisium without any show of resistance. In return for this he granted them later ἀτέλεια, and they enjoyed that privilege still in Appian's own day. The historian's words are

'δεξαμένων δ' αὐτὸν ἀμαχεὶ τῶν Βρεντεσίων τοῖσδε μὲν ὕστερον ἔδωκεν ἀτέλειαν ἣν καὶ νῦν ἔχουσιν.' (*B.C.* I. 79.)

A Latin colony had been founded at Brundisium in 244 B.C. But by the end of the Social War, *i.e.* before the time of which Appian in the above passage is writing, the city like all the rest of Italy had been granted the Roman civitas. It was allotted to the Tribus Maecia and ranked as a municipium, which rank it retained during the Empire. These are facts generally recognized. (Mommsen, *C.I.L.* ix. p. 8. Capelli, *Diz. Epig.* p. 1047, etc.)

This passage of Appian therefore offers a somewhat interesting problem. What was this Immunitas thus conferred about the year 80 B.C. on an Italian city community possessed of the Roman civitas, which also seems still to have differentiated that community from others in Italy in the days of Marcus Aurelius? For it is obvious that Appian's ἀτέλεια here is the equivalent of the technical term Immunitas. Unfortunately he does not specify it further. Hence we are left face to face with the above problem. For as it has been recently said 'welche Bedeutung ἀτέλεια ohne nähere Bezeichnung hat lässt sich nicht immer festsetzen.' (Pauly, *R. Enc.* p. 1911.)

We have at least these criteria in our attempt after a more exact characterisation of this Immunitas:

(1) It was a privilege bestowed on full Roman cives—on a whole city community of cives in Italy itself.

(2) It was a privilege still retained by that city community in Appian's own day, which thus still distinguished Brundisium from other cities in Italy.

(3) The original grant of this privilege was owed to Sulla about the year 80 B.C. This at least was either the popular tale in Appian's time or he found it so stated in his authorities. In the latter case, he may very well have derived the fact from the Memoirs of Sulla himself.

What then were the burdens from which the citizens of Brundisium were thus relieved? Some attempted answers to the question do not seem very satisfactory.

[a] Was this ἀτέλεια Immunitas from direct taxes which otherwise would have been levied on the Brundisians as cives in 80 B.C?

This seems improbable. For the only direct taxes a Roman cives would have had to pay then were

i. (possibly) The Tributum.

ii. The Vicesima manumissionum.

i. *The Tributum.*

It is certain that in practice this extraordinary tax was never levied after 167 B.C. until the days of the triumvirate in 43 B.C. (Pliny, *N.H.* 33, 56. Cic. *de Off.* ii. 22, 76. *Val. Max.* iv. 3, 8. Plutarch, *Aem. Paul.* 38). It seems however that it was never legally abolished—and thus the possibility of its being levied always existed. (Cic. *pro Flacco*, 32, 80. *Phil.* ii. 37, 93. *De Off.* ii. 21, 74, Dio Cass. 52, 6). Thus it might be urged the Immunitas granted Brundisium by Sulla was Immunitas from liability to pay tributum if it should ever again be levied.

Yet this very statement of the suggestion shows its own great improbability. In 80 B.C. the tributum had not been levied for nearly a century and there seemed no prospect of its being revived. Surely a grant of Immunitas from such a non-existent tax would have been—viewed as a privilege—somewhat of a mockery. Moreover this could have hardly been a privilege distinguishing the city in Appian's own day. For it seems almost certain that though the tributum was revived as an extraordinary tax by the triumvirate in 43 B.C., yet it was afterwards dropped again, and was not levied in the first and second centuries A.D. The tributum mentioned in Tac. *Ann.* xiii. 51, almost certainly applied to negotiatores not in Italy but in the provinces. (Marquardt, *Röm. Staatsver.* ii. pp. 171–173, espec. p. 172, N. 3).

Therefore that Sulla granted Brundisium Immunitas from the tributum seems to me an unsatisfactory explanation.

ii. *The Vicesima Manumissionum* or *Libertatis.*

This tax, levied first in 357 B.C. (Livy vii. 16, 7) seems therefore to have been the one and only direct tax a Roman cives was bound to pay in 80 B.C. (Cf. Cic. *ad Att.* ii.

16. Marquardt, *op. cit.* ii. p. 156, 271, 272.) It existed still in Cicero's time and was exacted under the Emperors throughout the whole Empire, till raised by Caracalla to 10 per cent. But if the master would not pay it on the freeing of a slave, the slave had to pay it himself. Immunitas therefore from this tax could hardly have been a great boon to the Brundisians in 80 B.C. In fact the tax is altogether somewhat too insignificant to allow us with easy consciences to accept it as an explanation of the ἀτέλεια in question existing in 80 B.C. and in the second century A.D.

Thus it is unlikely this Immunitas applied to direct taxes levied, or possibly to be levied, on cives in 80 B.C.

[b] But the previous question may be raised. It seems to be cautiously suggested that though Brundisium received the civitas before Sulla's landing, yet the financial consequences may not have followed immediately. Thus the city still continued to pay its old taxes which it had paid previously as a Latin colony. And what Sulla granted therefore was Immunitas from these. This seems to be the view held by Capelli, who says, speaking of Brundisium 'ebbe la cittadinanza romana al tempo della guerra sociale e fu allora inscritta nella tribù Maecia. La immunità in genere e forse da speciali imposte non fu concessa alla città che da Sulla.' (*Diz. Epig.* p. 1047).

Now of course it is an interesting question enough as to how rapidly the financial adjustment consequent on the universal grant of civitas in Italy was effected. But none the less it seems to me hardly necessary to stay on this account to discuss what were the taxes Brundisium paid as a Latin colony. For the privilege bestowed on the city by Sulla seems, as we have seen, still to have differentiated it from other Italian cities in Appian's day. Now it is plainly impossible to believe that those cities which before the Social War had been Latin colonies continued to pay their old munera as long after their enfranchisment as the second century A.D. This theory therefore fails to explain the problem satisfactorily.

[c] And precisely the same objection may be urged against Merivale's view of Sulla's act. For Merivale goes yet one step beyond Capelli, when he says, speaking of this general grant of civitas after the Social War:—

'Several cities...continued steadfastly to reject it...Brundisium did not at once accept it, but received the Roman privilege of Immunity from the land tax at a later period from Sulla.'

(*Fall of Rom. Rep.* c. 3, p. 97.)

Even though the Brundisians had been so foolish as to wait before receiving a part instead of at once accepting the whole of a boon, yet clearly long before Marcus Aurelius the free inhabitants of the city were full cives, and thus this explanation like the preceding fails to satisfy the second of our criteria. This very passage seems the sole basis of Merivale's theory.

[d] Another suggested solution is attractive at first sight. Marquardt (*op. cit.* i. 361–363) points out that under the Republic a municipium had ranked in importance above a colonia. But under the Empire this was reversed, and the colonia took precedence over the municipium. The colonia then might possess three privileges.

i. Libertas, from supervision of governor.

ii. Jus Italicum, *i.e.* Quiritarian rights in land ownership.

iii. Immunitas.

Therefore municipia came to desire to attain the jus coloniae. So Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 27:—'At in Italia vetus oppidum Puteoli jus coloniae et cognomentum a Nerone apiscuntur.' Gellius 16, 13.—'Hadrianus mirari se ostendit quod et ipsi Italicenses et quaedam item alia municipia antiqua, in quibus Uticenses nominat, cum suis moribus legibusque uti possent, in jus coloniae mutari gestiverint.' Now Brundisium was a municipium under the Empire. It is therefore suggested that Sulla granted it the Immunitas which was a feature of the jus coloniae, and this possession still distinguished it from other less fortunate Italian municipia in Appian's day.

But tempting though this interpretation may appear, it too proves unsatisfactory as soon as the question is raised 'Immunitas from what?' It is quite true that Immunitas *was* granted during the early Empire to communities of Roman cives. But these must all for very intelligible reasons have been *outside of Italy*. For communities of cives outside of Italy were liable to burdens which no Italian city had to bear. We have this stated in the clearest possible terms:—

'Prima enim conditio possidendi haec est ac per Italiam *ubi nullus ager est tributarius*. At si ad provincias respiciamus, habent agros colonicos euisdam juris, habent et colonicos qui sunt immunes, habent et colonicos stipendiarios.'

(Frontin, p. 35, Lachm. cf. Paulus, *Dig.* 50, 15, 8, §§ 5, and 7.)

Therefore on many a colony of Roman cives *outside Italy* it was possible to bestow that part of the jus Italicum known as Immunitas. For many such a colony paid the tributum soli. But a grant of this 'Immunitas' to a community inside Italy would have been meaningless. For none such paid any tributum soli. Brundisium like the rest enjoyed all possible Immunitas already, so far as direct burdens existing already in Sulla's day went. Puteoli in A.D. 60, and the 'ipsi Italicenses' in Hadrian's day, cannot have desired the jus coloniae to win Immunitas thereby, but for other reasons. For Immunitas they possessed already. We may not therefore argue from the position of a colonia civ. Rom. overseas to Brundisium, nor suppose the Immunitas won by such a colony at times to be anything but meaningless when applied to any municipium in Italy. This interpretation also proves inadequate.

[e] Immunitas under the Empire of course frequently meant freedom from the burdens of municipal office and municipal taxes. Clearly however this cannot be the ἀτέλεια thus bestowed on an entire community by Sulla. For in this case obviously there might have existed at any time neither municipality at all nor municipal chest. At any time municipal administration might have become impossible.

[f] Nor finally does it seem likely this was Immunitas from military service. Not only would this have scarcely been a boon, when the liability to such service became more and more theoretical than practical. But there are three Brundisian Inscriptions relative to service in fleet and army. (*C.I.L.* ix. 41, 42, 43).

None therefore of the above six explanations of this ἀτέλεια seems to me convincingly satisfactory. One possible explanation is left, and so far as I can discover one other only. And this is perhaps more promising than its predecessors.

Brundisium being a harbour city, it seems attractive to suppose that Sulla desiring to stimulate its trade made it a free port, or at least abolished the portoria there levied. An ἀτέλεια from such customs dues would always be an important gain to a harbour city. (Cf. Pauly, *R.E.* p. 1913, v. 5–10). But how far does this rendering of Immunitas satisfy the criteria?

The history of portoria in Italy is not devoid of interest, *i.e.* of difficulties. Under the Republic they were commonly levied at Italian ports, as at Puteoli in 199 B.C. (Livy. 32, 7) and Caius Gracchus extended the system widely (Vell. Pat. ii. 6). Therefore in Sulla's time Brundisium would almost certainly be liable to these dues, and a grant of ἀτέλεια from them be as real a benefit to the commercial prosperity of the city as Roman merchants at Delos found it in 167 B.C. Thus the first criterion is satisfied.

But portoria were generally abolished throughout Italy by the Lex Caecilia of 60 B.C. (Cic. *ad Att.* ii. 16. *ad Q. fr.* i. 1, 11, 33. Dio Cass. 37, 51.) Hence if it be true that this Immunitas still served to distinguish Brundisium in the days of Marcus Aurelius, this interpretation too seems unhappily imperilled. But not, I think, without hope of escape.

Julius Caesar, we are told, 'peregrinarum mercium portoria instituit.' (Sueton, *Caes.* 43.) What precisely this means is not quite clear. But even if it be taken at its least extension *i.e.* to mean that Julius laid a customs tax on all foreign goods imported into the Empire from lands outside the Empire (as Schiller, Die röm. Staatsalt, Müller, *Handbücher*, iv. 2, p. 678,) yet Immunitas from these might have meant something to a port like Brundisium. But in the second century A.D. the portoria may have meant considerably more than this. Not that I think we may press Dio's tale of the new τέλη introduced by the Triumvirate in 43 B.C. to include a revival of portoria (as Mr. Richards suggests in *Dict. Antiq.*) with any great confidence. But Tacitus, speaking of the year 58 A.D., says:—

'Eodem anno crebis populi flagitationibus immodestiam publicanorum arguentis, dubitavit Nero an cuncta vectigalia omitti juberet ...sed impetum eius...attinuere Senatores dissolutionem imperii docendo si fructus quibus respublica sustineretur deminuerentur, quippe *sublatis portoriis* sequens ut tributorum abolitio expostularetur.'

(*Ann.* xiii. 50.)

The 'people' which made complaint can hardly be held to exclude the citizens of Rome and Italy. And Cicero tells us that it was just the exactions of the publicani with regard to the collection of these very portoria which earlier were so bitterly resented. (*Ad Q. frat.* i. 1, 11, 33. So cf. Plutarch, *De Curios.* vol. viii p. 60 R). These portoria thus existing again under Nero were not abolished till for a short time by Pertinax who

'τέλη τε πάντα τὰ πρότερον ἐπὶ τῆς τυραννίδος ἐς εὐπορίαν χρημάτων ἐπινοηθέντα ἐπί τε ὄχθαις

ποταμῶν καὶ λιμέσι πόλεων...καταλύσας ἐς τὸ ἀρχαῖον καὶ ἐλεύθερον ἀφῆκεν.'
(Herodian, ii. 4, 7.)

Soon after which they were again re-instituted. (*Cod. Just.* 4, 61, 6. Marquardt, *op. cit.* ii. p. 262, N. 5.)

Thus portoria of some kind undoubtedly existed in Italian ports in Appian's day. Immunitas from these would have been a great benefit to Brundisium and have served to distinguish the city from others as occupying a peculiarly favourable position in the second century A.D. as well as under Sulla. This therefore seems to me the most probable rendering of Appian's vague statement with regard to the ἀτέλεια.

This question however remains. It is clear that for some time after 60 B.C. Brundisium was but on a level with all other Italian ports as regards freedom from portoria, but was again superior to most under Marcus Aurelius.

On the reintroduction of portoria therefore, to whom are we to ascribe the continuance or re-granting of this old Sullan privilege to the city? Here, so far as I know, conjecture only is possible. We may suppose either

(1) That when the portoria were revived, Brundisium made good its claim to special exemption because of its original bestowal by Sulla: or

(2) That a concession similar to that of Sulla was made to the city by some Emperor before Appian's day.

For if Appian had found the city enjoying this immunity in his own time, and knew that it had enjoyed a similar privilege under Sulla, he was in every way capable of implying that Brundisium had retained this ἀτέλεια uninterruptedly from 80 B.C. to his own lifetime. Though indeed his words need not be pressed to imply this.

Of the alternatives I must think the latter rather the more probable. For when all Italian ports had enjoyed this Immunitas for a good many years, it does not seem to me very likely that on the revival of the system of portoria a claim to exemption on the ground of a still earlier gift would be very readily accepted. Of course we tend here to be involved in a veritable quagmire of the *a priori*. But if we may attribute Brundisium's Immunitas with somewhat greater probability to a subsequent grant by an Emperor between Nero and Marcus Aurelius, I think there can be small hesitation before we choose Trajan as the Princeps most likely to confer the boon anew. Not indeed because Trajan remitted a portorium also on the Roman market (Marquardt, *op. cit.* ii. p. 270, N. 4). But because this would have been a measure so thoroughly in accord with this Emperor's endeavour to stimulate Italian trade on the East as well as on the West coast of Italy. And that Brundisium was the chosen centre for this endeavour, the construction of the great Via Traiana thither from Beneventum may serve to show. (Cf. *C.I.L.* ix. 37.)

Lastly there is a passage in the first chapter of the *De Rhetoribus* of Suetonius which is of considerable interest in this connection.[1] Suetonius is there describing the growth of the study of rhetoric. He says that the method of instruction which finally prevailed was that of using 'veteres controversiae'; that these were derived either 'ex historiis, sicut sane nonnullae usque adhuc,' or 'ex veritate ac re, si forte recens accidisset; itaque locorum etiam appellationibus additis proponi solebant. Sic certe collectae editaeque se habent, ex quibus non alienum fuerit unam et alteram exempli causa ad verbum referre.'

Therefore he immediately inserts two such examples. The first, which deals with a fishing bargain at Ostia, does not concern us. The second is for us the important one. It reads

'Venalici cum Brundusi gregem venalium e navi educerent, formoso et pretioso puero, quod portitores verebantur, bullam et praetextam togam imposuerunt; facile fallaciam celarunt. Romam venitur, res cognita est, petitur puer, quod domini voluntate fuerit liber, in libertatem.'

This it seems is a genuine passage of Suetonius and written probably between the years 106–113 A.D. (Cf. Roth. *Sueton*, Praef. pp. lxxv.–lxxviii.).

This passage proves the existence of portoria at Brundisium. The question is as to the time to which it refers. It is clearly an example cited as illustrating the second class of 'controversiae,' *i.e.* those 'ex veritate ac re, si forte recens accidisset.' On this question of date then we may note

(1) That it may be held to be one of the 'recent examples' by Suetonius, who is writing under Trajan.

(2) That yet it had happened long enough ago to be included then in a published collection of such controversiae.

(3) That the last example of such school-

[1] My best thanks are due to Mr. Warde Fowler of Lincoln College for suggesting it to me.

boy declamations quoted in this part of the treatise is that of 'Nero Caesar primo imperii anno.'

That a sure inference can be drawn from these three points I do not of course for one moment propose to maintain. But in view of these it *does* seem to me the most likely hypothesis to ascribe this incident of the exaction of portoria at Brundisium to a time before the reign of Trajan and probably after Nero's accession. Thus viewed, the passage is a confirmation of Tacitus *Ann.* xiii. 50 as to the revival of portoria again after their abolition in B.C. 60. And also it tends to strengthen the theory I venture in this paper to propose, viz.: that Trajan revived the gift once bestowed on Brundisium by Sulla.

Therefore from this chance allusion in Appian I would suggest the inference that Brundisium's trade and commercial prosperity were objects of interest to Sulla the Dictator, and also to some one of the Emperors before Marcus Aurelius; and further that Trajan is the Princeps to whom this may be best ascribed. But as one great justification for these conclusions must be the necessary rejection of all other explanations of this *ἀτέλεια* as less probable, I have therefore attempted to prove this in the first part of this paper.

BERNARD W. HENDERSON.

MERTON COLLEGE, OXFORD.
March, 1897.

SOME HOMERIC GENITIVES.

THE ordinary assumption is, I suppose, that Homer uses the genitives in *-ου*, *i.e.* *-οο*, or *-οιο*, indifferently as suits his verse; for myself at any rate, I always had made that assumption. It is obvious of course that with certain words the genitive in *-οιο* is impossible for an epic poet. All words with short penultimate and long antepenultimate must make the genitive in *-οο*, Ἀξιοῖο for instance being impossible. Again a long penultimate and short antepenultimate can only allow of the longer genitive at the expense of its being elided; thus for example Μενελάοιο is practically removed and the poets had to fall back on Μενελάοο.[1] The case is similar with words like *ζόφος*; *ζόφοιο* being impossible the poet could only use *ζόφοο*.

But it is equally certain, though less obvious, that in the days when the genitive was only in *-οιο* or *-οο*, when the latter was not yet contracted into *-ου*, no word could make its genitive in *-οο* if its penultimate and antepenultimate were both short; thus *ἄπαλόο* would be out of the question and the poet can only have used *ἀπαλοῖο*. At this period, which is pre-Homeric, there were three classes of the words with which I am now concerned; first, those which made the genitive only in *-οιο*, secondly those which made it only in *-οο*, thirdly those which made it in both, as *μύθοιο* and *μύθοιο*, *δόμοο* and *δόμοιο*, (*δόμοο* being possible by elision of final *ο* which must surely have once been permissible, whether or not in Homer, or else by interlengthening of final *ο* or lengthening before two consonants).

Now it appeared to me a somewhat interesting question whether any traces of this state of things exist still in Homer. I argued that if my speculations about the pre-Homeric condition, when *-οο* was not yet contracted, were correct, we might find that words like *μέγαρον*, Ἀλκίνοος, *εὔξεστος* etc. make the genitive in *-οιο* much more frequently than in *-ου*.

Accordingly I read through the *Odyssey* (down to *ψ.* 296 *bien entendu*) noting all the genitives of either of these two forms. With the aid of Dunbar's *Concordance*[2] I then made a list of all of them, which I tabulated and now present the results.

Let us first take the words which are metrically equivalent to *θάνατος* or *ἄπαλός*.

[1] Whether Μενελάοι' and the like were ever much used is a difficult question. That we hardly or never find such words with hiatus of *-ου in thesi* in our text might be explained on the hypothesis that such hiatus has been removed by alteration of the text, insertion of a particle or something of the kind. But my own view is that such a form as Μενελάοιο *by the Homeric period* had been almost or altogether driven out by the great natural advantages of such forms as Μενελάοο.

[2] In such a prodigious task as making a *Concordance* we must expect a few errors, and it is from no spirit of hostile criticism that I observe that some such are to be found here. Thus *ἀμφιπόλου* and *χρυσοπεδίλου* are both omitted by Dr. Dunbar. But if I have lost two or three cases, it will make no difference to the general results in so great a number.

From these there are in the *Odyssey* 217 genitives in *-οιο* and 55 in *-ου* (16 before a vowel, 39 before a consonant). Next words metrically equivalent to Ἀλκίνοος: 212 in *-οιο* 61 in *-ου* (25 before a vowel, 36 before a consonant, and of these 36 proper names furnish 23, and 6 of the 36 are in late passages). I take *ἡμέτερον* as the reading of *β.* 55, *η.* 301, *ρ.* 534 for *ἡμετέρου* is almost certainly wrong there, though given by the *Concordance* from the text of Ameis. Thirdly, other words where *-οο* is impossible, as *ἀποιχόμενος, δολιχήρετμος, κασίγνητος* etc.: 36 in *-οιο*, 16 in *-ου* (8 before a vowel, 8 before a consonant). Thus taking all three sets together, we have 465 genitives in *-οιο* against only 132 in *-ου*.

So far then the conjecture is verified. It really is true that the traces of an ancient time, when the genitive in *-οο* was not yet contracted, are to be found in Homer—and not in the most ancient part of him. But still there is a chance that it may be only because the long genitive is more convenient for the hexameter than the short, though as I have taken three classes of words separately and got the same results in all, this can hardly account for it. We must test the results then somehow, but this requires very great care. I have formerly had occasion to observe how much commoner the short genitive is than the long in the Bucolic poets; if we were to take a test from them, this peculiarity would make it worthless. But again if we should take our test from Apollonius, still more if from Nonnus, it would be vitiated by the opposite defect; for these conscious imitators of Homer, probably to give an archaic air to their compositions, use the long genitive by preference more than Homer does himself. We seem therefore to be reduced to Hesiod and the Hymns; I will take the *Works and Days*. Here (taking all three classes together) we have 26 genitives in *-οιο*[1] against 27 in *-ου*. The conclusion is that we might naturally expect the two forms to be about equally used, and that the great inequality in Homer is due to some disturbing cause, which cannot well, so far as I can see, be any other than that which I have suggested.

If such marked traces are to be found of a state of things when the genitive in *-οο* was not yet contracted into *-ου*, we have two ways of explaining the phenomenon open to us. Either in the Homeric period such contraction was still comparatively rare and was to a considerable degree avoided, or else the long forms had become so far fixed with *μέγαρον* and Ἀλκίνοος and the rest that they still were naturally used with these words, even though there was no objection any longer felt to scanning *-οο* as a monosyllable. Partly, no doubt, the preponderance of the long forms is due to old phrases being kept from the pre-Homeric period, but this can have had very little influence, and certainly is not the main cause. We might try to decide the question by seeing whether the long forms are commoner in the common words, of which *μέγαρον* might be quoted as a very strong example, for there are 44 instances of *μεγάροιο* against only one of *μεγάρου*; whether any conclusion can be drawn from the more numerous contractions of proper names I much doubt; but in any case I prefer to attack the problem from a different point of view. If the former hypothesis is the correct one, that is to say if there was still a certain difficulty in the Homeric period in contracting the genitive in *-οο*, then we ought to find that words like *νόστου, Θηβαίου*, and others where both the longer and the shorter forms were equally possible, are generally in such a position in the line that they can be resolved. Taking then the words which are trochaic in the *Odyssey*, as *ἀγρός*,[2] I find 77 unresolvable genitives in *-ου* against 121 or 126 resolvable; but of these 77 there are 44 at the end of a line, that is to say there are over 160 such genitives with the *-ου in thesi* to only 33 with it *in arsi*. And this is easily intelligible; with *νήσοο* for instance gradually becoming *νήσου*, it is obvious that it would be a much less shock to the ear to keep *νήσου* with the metrical beat on the first syllable; it is when the beat is thrown on to the *second* syllable that the ear will feel the objection to it. If I may venture to quote my own feelings, I think this distinction is valid. I have long felt something odd about such lines as *τὸν δ' οἷον νόστον κεχρημένον*, and a sort of instinct to be saying to myself *νόστοιο κεχρημένον* though I knew it to be wrong. But I never felt anything of the kind about a genitive at the end of a line.

In the *Works and Days* we have 6 resolvable genitives of this kind, 8 with *-ου in arsi*, 8 at the end of lines. The numbers are small but show plainly which way the wind blows.

Ought we then always to write *-οο* in Homer when we can? Nobody writes

[1] I am assuming the true reading of 705 to be *εὖει ἄτερ δ α ε λ ο ῖ ο καὶ ὠμῷ γήρᾳ' ἔδωκεν.*

[2] I have to omit *τούτου, αὐτοῦ, τοίου*, as they are not in the *Concordance*.

στηθη for στήθεα in Ionic poetry, even when στήθεα is a spondee: why then should we not write νήσοο for νήσου even when it is a spondee and leave the reader to see the scansion for himself? The only objection would be that in many of the instances we have -ου before a vowel. Are we then to write ϝοίκο' ἀπερχομένη? And why not after all, when ἔγχε' ἐρειδόμενος and the rest have been accepted? However it is obviously better to remain content with the ordinary reading in such cases; moreover it is very doubtful whether it does not come to the same thing; see Mr. Monro's *Homeric Grammar*, § 381. All that I feel at all sure about is that there was a certain reluctance to have the -ου *in arsi*, and this of course bears upon the first class of words such as ἁπαλός, Τηλέμαχος, κασίγνητος; for these, if they have the short genitive at all, must have it *in arsi*.

I proceed to the last class I shall consider, the genitives of pyrrhics, as δόμος. Omitting those of ἐμός, ἐϝός, ζύγον, θρόνος, κτύπος, σπόδος, στράτος, σκοπός, as either not in the *Concordance* or vitiated by beginning with two consonants so that ζύγοιο, etc. are impossible, I find in the *Odyssey*, 74 genitives in -οιο, 40 in -ου short before a vowel, 7 in -ου long before a vowel, 22 in -ου before a consonant. Thus we have 29 *in arsi* to 40 *in thesi*. Compare now the *Works and Days*: 4 in -οιο, 4 in -ου short before a vowel, 3 in -ου long before a vowel, 8 in -ου before a consonant; *i.e.* 11 *in arsi* to 4 *in thesi*. Again we see the same objection in Homeric verse to -ου *in arsi*. In the whole *Odyssey* from the first line to the bitter end I make the total number of instances of -ου *in arsi* (except τοῦ) to be 239. This includes one or two words like Αἰόλου which should be read Αἰόλοο. The proportion is thus about one in fifty lines. In the spurious termination it is perceptibly higher, about one in thirty.

Arthur Platt.

PROFESSOR FRANCKEN'S EDITION OF LUCAN.

Professor Francken has paid me the high compliment of replying to my criticisms of his edition of Lucan I—V [*C.R.* Feb. 1897]. It was perhaps hardly necessary to admit that my remarks were so often justified, even for the sake of explaining how the mistake arose. It is on the other hand a good thing to have an exact statement that codices U and V are in the new edition represented by a fresh and minute collation made by Prof. Francken himself. I never dreamt of implying that this was not so: but I am very glad to be told plainly that it is so.

The Professor's tone is not conciliatory. Let me say, if it be needed, that I was not hunting for chances of finding fault. Where he now shews that evidence of MS readings is wrongly given in Hosius and rightly in his own book, I am the first to welcome the vindication. In one or two places I had, it seems, not caught the exact meaning of his critical note: for which I am truly sorry.

I will not pass in wearisome review all the passages in which Prof. Francken's replies seem to me unsatisfactory. But here is a pretty instance of our differences. On I 453 I objected to the critical note '*datur* UMP', on the ground that the editor had no codex P available here. I suggested that this was a slip. His reply is that P stands for 'Proverbia', and he refers me to the 'indiculus praemissus'. I hope I do not err in taking this to mean the list on page xlii headed '*notae codicum*'. Anyhow I find there a mention of '*de libro Lucani proverbia* (Rhein. Mus. 1891)'. And the abbreviate symbol given for it is not 'P' but 'Prov'. Who is to blame?

When he comes to the interpretation of certain passages the Professor not seldom represents me as having said what I certainly did not say. I have only to apologize for having in these cases failed in conveying my meaning. He seems also, in discussing his alterations of the received text, to argue as though both sides stood on an equal footing. Now I rather hold that a corrector has a double task—first to displace the received text, then to make good his own. I still think that Dr. Francken seldom does the former, much less the latter, with success.

I will add a few words in reference to his argument against my reverence for the MSS tradition in the case of Lucan. The MSS do not, he says, carry us back further than the Carolingian age. He seems to fancy that I believe the text to have come

down to us without having suffered corruption during the eight centuries after Lucan's death. I certainly neither said nor thought anything of the sort. My contention is this. On Prof. Francken's own shewing [pp. xxii, xxvii] the recension now represented by V and its kindred MSS is as old as the fifth century at least. M and its kindred are derived from a separate line of copies. This is set forth by Dr. Francken [p. xxxvi]. Therefore in one form or other we have two independent lines of tradition. If this be so, what is the authority of readings in which both traditions agree? I said (and say still), it is so great that we ought not to set it aside on the ground of arguments from within, unless those arguments are of quite overwhelming cogency. Further, assume that the collective wisdom of modern scholars decides that a certain traditional reading is undoubtedly corrupt. Nay, assume again that they agree to accept a particular correction. And lastly, assume that this 'correction' is an improvement. I answer as follows. I respect the negative *virorum doctorum consensus*, but it does not amount to mathematical certainty. Affirmative *consensus* is very rare indeed, and it tells only (at the most) what the writer ought to have written. In the case of Lucan there is no little reason for thinking that he often wrote what he had better not have written. Therefore, to improve the text is not necessarily the same thing as restoring the author's words. The inference is, put what you please in your notes, but be very slow to meddle with the text.

To take a recent instance. In VII 141 we have *tunc omnis lancea saxo erigitur*. The late Prof. Nettleship proposed *derigitur* This Dr. Postgate rightly rejects, but conjectures *corrigitur*. Mr Owen (*C.R.* April 1897) rejects this, and proposes *exigitur*. Now there is negative agreement enough. But what is the metaphor in *erigitur*? I believe it means 'set up straight on end', applied to what has been beaten down. A daring way of saying 'brought to a point', but I do not think it is too bold for Lucan. The spear head is to begin with rather blunt than bent, and it is ground to a new point. The sense of 'made fit for action' may also hang about the word. Compare Stat. Theb. iii 582–4

> tunc fessa putri robigine pila
> haerentesque situ gladios in saeua recurant
> uolnera et attrito cogunt iuuenescere saxo.

and Sidon Apollinaris vii 412

> dum falce recocta
> ictibus informat saxoque cacuminat ensem.

With the MSS tradition at its back, I would let *erigitur* stand.

I have wandered from Prof. Francken, of whom let me take leave with many thanks and high respect. W. E. Heitland.

27 *April*, 1897.

ARISTIDES AND THE BATTLE OF SALAMIS.

I had occasion in the March number of the *Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles* to discuss the interesting article which Professor Bury contributed to the *Classical Review* of December 1896 on some points connected with the Battle of Salamis. It will be remembered that Professor Bury supports his theory that Aristides was one of the regular strategi, in command of the land forces stationed on Salamis, by connecting his timely arrival at that island on his way from Aegina (Hdt. VIII. 79) not with his first return from exile, but with a special mission which had been sent to bring from Aegina the images of the Aeacidae. As the *Revue* is not yet widely known on this side of the Channel, it may be worth while to bring before the notice of your readers two suggestions which I made in it on this point, the more especially as Professor Bury has kindly written to say that he accepts them.

The first is the meeting of an obvious objection. How is it, it may be asked, that Herodotus not merely fails to associate the discharge of this mission with the name of Aristides, but seems to imply that while he reached Salamis overnight, the trireme with the Aeacidae did not do so till the next morning (viii. 79, 83)?

The answer is that Aristides did not arrive till after midnight (viii. 70, 75, 76 and 81), so that the fleet in general must have already 'turned in,' and could not realise the presence of the Aeacidae till the next morning.

Thus the two events, the appearance of Aristides before the Council, and the first popular welcome given to the Heroes that were to guide to victory, would be from the outset dissociated in Herodotus' mind. Neither Aristides nor Themistocles, we may be sure, gave a thought to the Aeacidae that night. The 'See! They've come!' of the common sailors was the point of interest and the source of information.

The second point is a slight correction, a correction, however, which strengthens Professor Bury's general position, by bringing it into closer relation to Herodotus' narrative. Aristides cannot, as he thought, have had a right to take part in the Council. Only one general can have been allowed in it from each city. The Athenian system of divisional commands could not entitle them to a preponderance of voting strength. Whether or no Aristides was a strategus, he was certainly not the Athenian commander-in-chief, and we can therefore still follow Herodotus when he tells us that he was only admitted on sufferance, and withdrew as soon as the news was told (viii. 80, 81).

I may add that the only serious objection to this part of Professor Bury's theory that occurs to me is that the Aeginetans seem to have claimed credit for the subsequent achievements of the trireme which brought the Aeacidae (viii. 84), and that it is improbable that an Athenian would be put in even temporary command of an Aeginetan ship. It may be argued however that the fact that the Aeacidae were their own local Heroes would be itself enough to account for the Aeginetans' interest. If, however, as seems more probable, the ship was their own, Aristides need not have been in direct command, but may have gone under its escort as the representative of the rest of the fleet. In this case indeed we have a fine instance of the Panhellenism of the hour, of the deliberate reconciliation of Athens and Aegina in face of the common enemy.

Herodotus does not tell us in so many words whether or no it was an Aeginetan ship in any one of the three passages in which he refers to it (viii. 64, 83, 84), but it is improbable that we can found on this any valid argumentum ex silentio.

RONALD M. BURROWS.

HORRET IMPERSONAL.

IN Mr. E. W. Watson's interesting essay 'The Style and Language of St. Cyprian,' contained in vol. iv. of *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, Oxf. 1896, I read (p. 313):

'The only impersonal verb which appears first in Cyprian is:—

horret 781 18 [of Hartel's edition] *nec delectat id dicere quod aut horret aut pudet nosse.* This does not seem to be cited elsewhere; was it improvised by Cyprian for uniformity with *pudet?*'

Two Christian writers possibly were led by Cyprian to combine *horret* and *pudet.*

Cassian. inst. xii. 28 pr. *audivi in hac dumtaxat regione quod horret pudetque revolvere, quendam iuniorum, cum a suo increparetur abbate, cur humilitatem, quam renuntians permodico tempore retentaret, coepisset excedere, . . . summa contumacia respondisse. . .*

Oros. hist. vii. 4, 10 *referre singillatim facta eius horret pudetque.*

None of the editors of the Vienna series notice this usage in their *indices.* Indeed any arguments drawn from the silence of such an *index* are precarious to the last degree. The only remaining example which I have at hand is of course independent of Cyprian.

Ammian. xxix. 2, 15 *horret nunc reminisci quo iustitio humilitati tot rerum apices visebantur.*

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

ON SOPHOCLES' *TRACHINIAE*, 781, 782.

DR. H. W. HAYLEY and myself were discussing, the other day, the difficult passage in the account of the murder of Lichas, which has come down to us in this shape:—

κόμης δὲ λευκὸν μνελὸν ἐκραίνει μέσοι
κρατὸς διασπαρέντος αἵματός θ' ὁμοῦ,

and has given rise to numerous conjectures, when it occurred to us that the following

version, involving the change of three letters, would be satisfactory and probable:—

κοπῇι δὲ λευκὸν μυελὸν ἐκραίνει μέσου
κρατός, διασπαρέντος αἵματος θολοῦ.

κοπῇι is an older suggestion of Hense's; θολοῦ was found by Mr. Hayley and myself together, in such a way that it is hard for either of us to claim it. I cannot prevail on Mr. Hayley to print this conjecture over his own signature, although we both think that it should be made known.

The adjective θολός is known from Athenaeus and lexicographers, and is implied in the verb θολόω.

F. D. Allen.

Harvard University, January 1897.

AUSONIUS (?) *IDYL* 13.

Quam longa una dies, aetas tam longa rosarum:
Cum pubescenti iuncta senecta brevis.
or Quas pubescentis iuncta senecta premit.
Quam modo nascentem rutilus conspexit Eous,
Hanc rediens sero vespere vidit anum.
Sed bene, quod paucis licet interitura diebus
Succedens (*or* -ndens) aevum prorogat ipsa suum.
Collige, virgo, rosas, dum flos novus et nova pubes,
Et memor esto aevum sic properare tuum.

In the last two lines the poet bids the maiden gather her rosebuds while she may; she is to gather her flowers betimes, while she is as yet a fairer flower than they. As in Herrick and as in Milton, so here too the notion of 'gathering roses' is bound up with the notion of 'being gathered': the poet is, in fact, playing with two ideas at once, as the remainder of his hexameter clearly shows. But what has the last couplet but one to do with these ideas? 'Rosa succedens aevum prorogat ipsa suum' means, I suppose, 'the rose-bush yields fresh roses to replace those that die.' 'Rosa' for 'rose-bush' is in itself sufficiently awkward in a poem in which the word is continually and consistently used in the sense of 'a rose.' But it is impossible after the line that precedes it, in which *interitura* has nothing to do with a rose-*bush*, but only with a rose blossom.

The maiden is invited to make the most of her youth: for youth is short-lived like the rose. But, if she is to learn the lesson from the rose, the poet must have said that the rose makes the most of its youth. If she is to prolong her youth by 'gathering her flowers', that is by submitting herself to be gathered, she must be told that the rose too prolongs its life by letting itself be gathered. The thought that we require is supplied by the elegant lines of Florus on the rose:

totum lux quarta peregit
floris opus. Pereunt hodie nisi mane leguntur;

to which an anonymous hexameter adds a sort of Scholium in these words:

ne pereant lege mane rosas: cito virgo senescit.

Returning to our own passage, I think it will now be clear that for *Succedens* we require *Succidens*. The rose is said to prolong its own life by *cutting it short*; in other words, by allowing itself to be plucked.

E. C. Marchant.

NOTES ON AUSONIUS.

The following notes may be useful to future commentators. It has often been remarked with surprise how little Juvenal has been cited or copied by later authors.

The following passages in Ausonius seem reminiscences of the Satirist: and cadences in whole passages might be cited as echoes of those in his great original.

(1) Epigrammata xxxv. 9, 10.
Miremur periisse homines? Monumenta fatiscunt,
Mors etiam saxis, nominibusque venit. Cf. Juv. x. 146.

(2) Comm: Prof. i. Tiberius Orator 17.
Dicendi torrens tibi copia. Juv. x. 9.

(3) Comm: Prof. Victorio Subdoctori xxii. 3.
Exesas tineis opicasque evolvere chartas. Juv. iii. 207.

(4) Sap. Ludius 6.
Finem intueri longae vitae quo iubes. Juv. x. 274.

(5) *Epitaphia Heroum.* xv. Astyanacti. Flos Asiae.

(6) *Monosticha de ordine* xii. Imperatorum. (12) Frater, quem Calvum dixit sua Roma Neronem. Juv. iv. 38.

(7) Ausonii villula 25. Fons propter, puteusque brevis. Juv. iii. 226.

(8) *Idyllia* iv. 46. Conditor Iliados. Juv. xi. 180.

(9) *Id.* xiii. *ad fin.* The line is quoted and the author named.
Curios simulant, et Bacchanalia vivunt. Juv. ii. 3.

(10) *Id.* xv. Votisque optata malignis.
In Epigram xl. ἀκίνδυνος is pronounced by accent as in modern Greek.

The following approximations to Romance seem interesting.

Epigram lxxii. 2. Testa = tête.

Gregorio epistula. Mulieres...non hae de nostro saeculo quae sponte peccant. = 'de notre siècle.'

Gratiarum Actio. O de pectore candidissimo lactei sermonis alimoniam!

He uses the following Gaulish words:—paradas, mannos, veredos.

H. A. Strong.

A QUESTION IN ACCENTUATION.

The personal name Deidas or Didas caused some doubt in my *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, Pt. II. no. 294; and among the *corrigenda* at p. 353 the variation of opinion is noted between Schubart, who has Δίδας in Paus. v. 21, 15 (as I have written), and Dittenberger-Purgold, who read Δειδᾶς in the *Inscriptions of Olympia* no. 228. I notice that the same difficulty has been felt by at least one of the editors of the *Berlin Urkunde* (*Griech.*), Dr. Viereck, who in no. 78 reads Διδᾶ, but in no. 88 Δείδα, without giving any explanation of his change of view—perhaps it is merely due to a slip, but, then, which accentuation represents his mature opinion? Similarly Διδᾶ no. 138 (Wilcken), but Δείδα no. 155 (Krebs); apparently treating Deidas and Didas as two distinct words; but they are mere varieties of spelling. Kretschmer, I think, has Δίδας in his instructive *Einl. in d. Gesch. d. gr. Spr.*; but I cannot quote the page. Pape has Δίδας. The name is known in Egypt (*Berl. Urk. ll. cc.* and Paus. v. 21, 15), Syrian Antioch (*Inscr. Olymp.* no. 228), Apameia of Phrygia (*Cit. and Bish.* no. 294–295), and Julia-Gordus of Lydia (*Bull. Corr. Hell.* 1884, p. 382). Pape mentions only the Egyptian use. Perhaps some evidence unquoted by the authorities above mentioned may be known to some reader of the *Classical Review*.

W. M. Ramsay.

CORRECTION TO NOTE ON P. 206.

It has been pointed out by a correspondent that of the Ciceronian passages to which Prof. Mayor refers in the May number of the *Classical Review* (p. 206) the first is from Cicero's speech for Ligarius § 11, and the second is given at the end of the text of the speech for Flaccus in the editions of C. F. W. Müller, Baiter (Orelli, ed. 2) and in some others.

DE RIDDER'S *L'IDÉE DE LA MORT.*

De l'idée de la mort en Grèce à l'époque classique, par A. DE RIDDER, Docteur ès Lettres, etc. Paris, Thorin et fils. 1897. 5 francs.

THIS tract of 200 pages is interesting, readable, and well-timed. The general proposition which it illustrates is one which, however familiar and incontestable in theory, needs constant reinforcement to keep it sufficiently before our minds. Of *the* religion, or even *the* religious ideas, which prevailed in Greece during the classical period, we must not speak, as if it or they were fixed and definite. At Athens—and it is only with reference to Athenian thought that we have information copious and continuous enough to found a history—it is a development, which we have to study, an evolution, a passing forwards, or perhaps backwards and forwards, from certain ideas to certain others quite different and even contradictory, in religion as in other departments. The 'state' of things is a term scarcely applicable. In dealing with our own times or those near to us we are apt to exaggerate differences and distinctions; in remote times, the shades and contrasts, which were of vital importance at the moment, are easily lost in the one broad opposition of which we are naturally conscious, the opposition between now and then. In spite of many formulae, we do not without effort actually realize that between the contemporaries of Aristotle and the contemporaries of Aeschylus there were differences as deep as any which separate either age from our own, as deep and for the practical purposes of the hour far more important. In religion, as in life generally, the lines of division and lines of union, upon which European thought was to be planned, were traced in Greece, and more particularly in Athens, between the epochs of Pisistratus and Alexander. M. de Ridder, starting from the true proposition that religion, in the sense commonly understood, depends for its character essentially upon the question 'What is the nature of death?', proposes to demonstrate

> que sur ce point essential les idées des Hellènes ont changé du tout au tout dans la période même que nous étudions. La mort, d'abord tenue, ou peu s'en faut, pour complète et totale, est bientôt presqu'universellement regardée comme un moment de transition et comme un simple changement de l'être: par suite, la vie, d'abord principe unique d'action, tend à n'être bientôt plus que la préparation, plus ou moins directe et sérieuse, à une existence ultérieure et prochaine.

In pursuance of this plan we have a 'first part' to show the all-sufficiency of human life as conceived during the period of intense energy covered by the Persian wars and the rise of the Athenian empire, and a 'second part' on the 'tendances contraires et nouvelles', distributed between the laws and traditions relating to the disposition of the dead, the influence of individual thinkers and writers, and, most significant of all, the religions of the mysteries. In a third part, which stands to the rest in a different relation, reviewing the ground from a particular point of view, the author endeavours to point out the influence of the fundamental change as exhibited in the funeral monuments of Attica. On this sequel or appendix, which is really a little treatise in itself, those must pronounce whose acquaintance with the subject-matter is greater than mine. It is evident that here the estimation of the evidence is embarrassed by some peculiar difficulties; nor am I sure, though I would assert nothing positive, that these difficulties are practically surmountable. There are at present radical doubts as to the interpretation of the marble documents. M. de Ridder, for instance, disagrees altogether with Dr. Furtwängler as to what is represented or signified by those monuments which exhibit a group of persons, or a pair, with clasped hands. Where, and in what life, the scene of these interviews is laid, this, and other fundamental positions, are still open to debate. Then again there is the question of the artist's competence to express his meaning, and how far we can assume that it is intelligibly expressed, questions of small scope when we deal with the art of the pen, but troublesome when we turn to the chisel. So far as I can judge, the author merits in this portion the attention at any rate of competent archaeologists; this said, we will confine ourselves to the cardinal antithesis of the book, as exhibited in the two previous parts.

On the broad issues and main lines the author's account seems to be just, and is certainly expressed in a clear and instructive form. The doctrine of an after-life, if it was not newly evolved, so far as concerned Hellas, in the course of the classical period, did then for the first time assume that aspect, form, and colour which made it important and dominant in the field of morality. Of the agencies by which it was evolved, the

most active by far would appear to have been the 'mystic' cults, if we give to that somewhat vague term a sufficiently large and also a sufficiently precise signification. Whether Eleusis, in its proper function, did much, may be doubted, but the 'Bacchic' and 'Orphic' movements cover between them almost the whole operation, and achieved so much, that, without grave exaggeration, the history of Europe, down to the adoption of Christianity as the official religion of the Empire, might be described as the conversion of the Mediterranean peoples to 'Bacchism'. The general account of 'the mystic religions,' given by M. Ridder, is so well put, that, though it contains perhaps little or nothing positively new to students of Rohde and other investigators, it deserves to be quoted textually so far as space will permit:

> Tout grec, pour peu qu'il fût citoyen prenait part, de plein droit, aux sacrifices offerts aux dieux de la cité. Le rituel exigeait bien que certains actes solennels fussent réservés aux prêtres, mais ces prêtres étaient et des magistrats et des citoyens; de plus, leurs actes étaient publics. Les sectes mystiques recueillaient partout leurs adhérents, sans conditions civiques ni droits exclusifs . . . Enfin leurs cérémonies étaient secrètes. . . . *Originalité plus grande encore, ces religions mystiques avaient, pour la plupart, un dogme, si imparfait d'ailleurs et si grossier qu'il fût.* Qui sacrifiait à Zeus ou à Héra, n'avait pas besoin de se faire de Zeus ou d' Héra une idée déterminée. . . . Par contre on n'était pas libre de croire ou ne pas croire aux religions mystiques. Qui se faisait initié était d'abord éprouvé, puis instruit. . . . Une dernière différence était que ces doctrines, distinctes entre elles, se ressemblaient en ce qu'elles étaient mystiques. Honorer les divinités de la cité était s'assurer de leur protection, ou était tout au moins un moyen d'éviter leur malveillance. Mais l'adorant avait beau faire les dieux à son image, il se sentait loin des êtres auxquels il sacrifait. Le culte ni diminuait ni n'augmentait la distance; c'était un moyen de plaire, une simple demande faite aux dieux. *Au contraire, les religions mystiques tendaient à rapprocher l'homme de la divinité. L'idéal était d'élever et de soulever l'être humain, de le transporter d'un enthousiasme divin, de faire qu'il s'exaltât au point de devenir Dieu.* Rien n'était plus que cette conception opposé au culte officiel et populaire. Rien aussi n'importe davantage à notre étude.

It is indeed obvious that the possibility of receiving such doctrines as are here outlined must depend absolutely upon a corresponding conception of the human soul, of its separation from mortality, of its affinity to the immortal, its essential immortality; and on the other hand that from such conceptions of the soul and of death, religious doctrines substantially identical with those of 'the mystic religions' would necessarily grow. The field of M. de Ridder's investigation is really co-extensive with that of these religions and their diffusion, perhaps more exactly coincident than the form of the tract would suggest. But at all events the chapter devoted to them specially is worthy of its beginning, and presents the matter in a trustworthy and serviceable way.

It would be scarcely fair to criticise minutely the chapter on 'the philosophers and authors.' If we must compress into sixteen pages an account of what is to be found, bearing on the general problem of life and death, in philosophy from Protagoras to Plato inclusive, and in literature from Aeschylus to Euripides inclusive, we cannot have completeness, or even exactness, more especially when allowance is made for the fact that the authors themselves, even the most elaborate and systematic, cannot be pinned to a fixed and absolutely consistent opinion. Plato, says M. de Ridder, 'has strictly banished from the soul every element of matter, everything which pertains to body and the imperfections of existence upon earth.'

> Sans doute, sur la terre et dans la vie l'être individuel est complexe. L'énergie et l'activité (*τὸ θυμοειδές*) lui viennent de ce qu'il est double, à la fois pensée et corps, idée et matière. . . . Aussi l'esprit ne survit pas plus que le courage à l'union de l'âme et du corps. Le seul élément qui ne périsse pas, le seul être véritable de l'âme, sa substance et son tout, c'est la faculté qu'elle a de raisonner.

This is perhaps as true to Plato as the limits permit, and sufficiently true for the purpose of the treatise; yet the gaps in the statement, as an exposition of Platonism, are plain enough. But in truth neither Plato nor Platonism, nor any of the great doctors, had very much to do with the revolution which concerns M. de Ridder, the revolution which, once launched, never stayed till it had destroyed and rebuilt the whole of the European world. The future, for better or for worse, was not with the schools, nor even with the theatre, but with certain obscure little congregations and *cenacula*, of which neither drama nor lecture had much to tell, which assembled obstinately, by night, if it might not be by day, in the hills, if it might not be in the market-place, to receive the instruction of a *bacchus*, (or whatever name might be most in vogue for the divinified man), to perform the *hora*, and through the innate capacity of their own spirits, to become themselves *bacchi* and divine, even now and here, but in expectation of that time when 'the journey' should be accomplished, 'the haven' reached, and the initiate joined for ever to the rites of the blest.

It is no fault of M. de Ridder, but on the contrary, a proof of his true historical sense,

that of his 'second part,' which deals nominally with 'tendencies contrary' to the ancient Hellenic views of life '*and new*', not a little is given to showing us that the tendencies in question were not precisely new, but grew out of seeds long planted, which now had found their spring. Shadowy and unreal as was the world of the dead to the Greek of the earliest historical age, there was and had been for ages an abundance of practices which depended for their meaning on the supposition that the dead person was *something*, nay, a power. To the sections upon 'the worship of the dead,' 'the fear of the dead,' 'heroes,' and 'Hades,' there is in general little to object. But upon one point the author, as it appears to me, lays down principles which, if not altogether without foundation, go far beyond the warranty. Curiously enough, and creditably rather for the candour of the author, the effect of this exaggeration is to diminish, not to increase, the apparent importance of the revolution which he desires to signalize. Manifestly, the larger the function performed in Greek life, before the classical epoch, by supposed personal activity and power residing in the souls of the dead, the less the importance of that development in popular thought, by which the 'after-world' became real and significant to the inhabitants of this. Now, according to M. de Ridder, that function governed, among other things, nothing less than the whole theory and practice of the highest criminal justice. Trial and punishment for murder, according to him, rested, in the conception of the Greeks, essentially upon the necessity of respecting the will of the dead:

> Le principe est l'essentiel, et comme nous l'avons vu, ce principe est très net: la sentence est ou doit être l'expression de la volonté du mort (p. 73).

The wide bearing of this proposition, if true, upon the whole evolution of Hellenic society and thought, is sufficiently manifest. But what is the proof of it? Really it seems that there is substantially no evidence at all. That the alleged evidence is almost confined to the one case of Athens is not perhaps the fault of the author. In all 'Hellenic' questions we are but too likely to find ourselves no better provided. But what is the evidence from Athens? Practically nothing else, if we do not misunderstand, but that the chief Athenian murder court, the Areopagus, was closely connected, by its place of sitting, with 'the sanctuary of the Erinyes,' and that 'the Erinyes' were evolved, as persons, from a more vague conception of 'avenging spirits,' that is to say, of the dead themselves regarded as avengers. This latter proposition is undoubtedly true, and the evidence for it is well stated by M. de Ridder (pp. 87 foll.); the 'three Furies' of poetic mythology, with their snakes and other attributes, were an invention of historical times; and the first beginning of them, so far as the existing materials enable us to judge, can hardly be traced beyond Aeschylus. But, given that primitively an 'Erinys' was virtually a self-avenging ghost, we are still no nearer to the conclusion that the functions of the Areopagus, as a court of murder, were based upon duty towards ghosts, unless it can further be proved that the court, by origin and tradition, owed especial duty to 'Erinyes.' As a matter of fact, it is more than doubtful whether, before the famous drama of Aeschylus, 'Erinyes' or 'the Erinyes' had the slightest connexion with the court, except (upon one single legendary occasion) in the capacity of suitors. They were said to have prosecuted Orestes there; but that the court was first instituted for this purpose was not alleged; on the contrary the origin of the court was connected with Ares and the name of the hill, by a story which Aeschylus (to make room for his new view) has to displace and contradict. Nor were the 'Erinyes' worshipped there, either by the court or by its suitors. There was close by a certain cavern-sanctuary, dedicated to the 'good fairies' of Attica, who bore, like other such powers, a mysterious name, that of the *Semnai*. That the court, and those who underwent trial there, paid respect to these powers, as local powers, followed as a matter of course, according to the spirit of Hellenic observances, from the fact of their local presence, and needs no explanation to be sought in the function of the tribunal. Aeschylus, who, for certain political reasons and for still more powerful reasons connected with his theological belief and religious feelings, was bent on the conversion of all 'Erinyes' to gentleness and subordination, chose to assert, not indeed in terms but by manifest spectacular implication, that '*the* Erinyes,' whom for this very purpose he endowed with a fixed and limited individualities such as before they had never possessed, were in some mysterious manner identifiable with these local *Semnai* or 'good fairies.' That the legendary and traditional conception of the respective powers afforded any ground for this the play itself would hardly allow us to believe; nor is there any external proof of it. Nor did the identification succeed, so

far at least as concerned the local usage. The Furies of the dramatist had indeed a prodigious literary and artistic success, giving birth to a whole train of poetry and art. But the 'Semnai' did not become 'Erinyes'; they did not even become 'Euménides'; they remained the 'Semnai'. A modern author, dominated by the great drama and its sequel of associations, may write 'Les trois hiéropes *des Érinyes* étaient choisis parmi les membres [de l'Aréopage], et chaque partie invoquait, avant de plaider, l'assistance *des Euménides*,' and may refer us without suspicion to 'Demosthenes 21, 115.' But if we turn to the Greek, we read simply, *περιεῖδε δὲ ταῖς σεμναῖς θεαῖς ἱεροποιὸν αἱρεθέντα ἐξ Ἀθηναίων ἁπάντων τρίτον αὐτὸν καὶ καταρξάμενον τῶν ἱερῶν*. What proof is here that the local deities of the cavern were conceived by this orator as avengers of murder or as personifications of ghosts, or as 'Euménides,' at all, not to say as 'Erinyes', or that, even if in those days the not very numerous readers of Aeschylus may sometimes have applied his conception to real life, that conception had already been established at the epoch when the council of Athens began to sit as a court for murder upon 'Ares' Hill'? When it has been shown that the 'Semnai' of the Areopagus (not the 'Erinyes') were originally or ever conceived as ghosts, one step at least will have been taken towards establishing, for Athens, a special connexion between the duty of the state to repress murder and obligation towards the spirits of the dead. At present it does not appear that this obligation was more important to the Hellenic law of homicide than to any other. It may, perhaps must, have had some influence, in Hellas as elsewhere; but we are far indeed from the 'well-marked and essential principle' that 'the sentence (of the court) expresses or should express the will of the dead.'

Let us hasten to add that the exaggeration (to say the least) in this matter is by no means characteristic of the author. In general he uses his evidence quite legitimately. A few queries marked in passing may be noticed rapidly. The statement concerning those who die in battle that 'seuls en effet ils sont enterrés dans la terre paternelle' (p. 32) does not stand very firmly upon 'Aeschylus, *Agam.* 511-2.' On p. 38 the question 'what epitaph the Greeks can put upon the tomb of Astyanax?' (*Eur. Tro.* 1188) is assigned by a slip of the pen to Astyanax himself. The 'envie' (*φθόνος*) which according to Eur. *El.* 29, deters Clytaemnestra from putting Electra to death is surely not specially, or at all, the fear of her ghost. It is the fear of the *vox populi*, and, in a secondary way, of the gods. Is it certain or probable that (p. 90) the Harpies, the Gorgons, and the Sirens 'représentaient la vengeance des morts'? The ghosts, at this rate, threaten to become as rapacious in mythology as the Sun. That 'le drame sortit de la religion dionysiaque' is doubtless a commonplace of school-tradition ancient and modern, and must, as would seem, be true in some sense. But in what sense, and whether the proposition, rightly understood and limited, would have much to do with 'Dionysiac religion' in its true essence, as properly understood by M. de Ridder, may be doubted. 'Si Hérakles ose affronter vivant les ténèbres d'Hades, c'est qu'il est initié (Eur. Hérakles 611-613)' (p. 140). It seems that in this case the *mystae*, whose sacred emblems Heracles saw, were themselves celebrating their rites in Hades. However a like grace could no doubt have been attributed to the rites of this world. The author (p. 142) seems disposed to deny or minimise any sacramental or symbolic meaning in the rites of Eleusis. That Aristophanes understood them, or some of them, sacramentally, appears to me certain from the *Δήμητερ, ἣ θρέψασα τὴν ἐμὴν φρένα* which he put into the mouth of Aeschylus. But the obscurity of the whole subject probably comes in no small part from the fact that the worshippers saw and interpreted according to their various tendencies, and that there was no efficient tribunal of orthodoxy.

To return however in conclusion to the main proposition. We must agree with M. de Ridder in thinking that, during the classical age of Greece, certain tendencies, some of them new, some of them old as time but revived and modified by the hour, produced a revolution in religion. That revolution was not less important to the history of Europe than the other innovations of that extraordinary age. And the author's account of it, whatever questions may be raised upon points of detail, is true, fresh, and interesting.

A. W. Verrall.

HUNZIKER ON THE FIGURE HYPERBOLE IN VIRGIL.

RUDOLF HUNZIKER, *Die Figur der Hyperbel in den Gedichten Vergils.* Berlin, Mayer und Müller, 1896. M. 3.60.

THAT Latin is a rhetorical language, and that Virgil is an extremely rhetorical poet, may be assumed to be pretty well known, but it has perhaps never been so convincingly brought home to us than by Mr. Hunziker in the book the title of which has been printed at the top of this article. His method is lucid and simple. Beginning with the definition of a hyperbole, he divides hyperboles into those of distance, multitude, sound, mass, etc., and then gathers the places of Virgil where they occur, whilst the passage in Homer which gave rise to the hyperbole, is mentioned, and several other writers, ancient and modern, are quoted. Regarding the latter, it would appear that quoting a modern author in editing classics, is considered somewhat of a sin in Germany, as is borne out by the curious note on p. 72, where the author with respect to a commentary of Ludwig-Schaper on *Aen.* ix. 422, containing a quotation from Ossian's *Fingal*, makes the following remark: 'Warum dies aber weder in der Ursprache noch mit genauer Angabe der betreffenden Stelle geschieht, ist mir unerklärlich und zeigt, wie es—grundlos genug—vielfach noch für eine Sünde angesehen wird, den heiligen Apparat der classischen Parallelen in Schulausgaben mit moderner Zutat zu "verunreinigen!"' Let us hope this is an 'überwundener Standpunkt' in other countries!

The author gives evidence of wide and varied reading, which may be proved by the fact that he quotes not only from the classics, ancient and modern, in a narrower sense, but also from authors like Claudianus, Columella, Manilius, Silius, Valerius, Apollonius Rhodius, Musaeus, Ronsard, Ariosto, Tasso, Camoëns, Geibel, Grillparzer, Hebbel, Kleist, Leuthold, Tegnér, Byron, and Ossian.

A few striking instances of Virgil's love of exaggeration are e.g. *Aen.* i. 498 *sqq.* compared with ζ 105 *sq.*; *Georg.* iii. 541 *sqq.* containing no less than three hyperboles; *Aen.* xii. 899 *sq.* compared with E 302 *sqq.* and M 445 *sqq.* (in Homer the ancient heroes fling stones which no *two* men of latter times, οἷοι νῦν βροτοί εἰσι, would suffice to carry; in Apollonius Rhodius *four* of these would be required; in Virgil no less than *twelve!*); and *Aen.* iii. 567, with which majestic hyperbole the opening lines of Shakespeare's *Othello* ii. 1 are compared. Furthermore in the book about the bees, *Georg.* iv., all sorts of high-flown and high-sounding expressions are often used, without their being in harmony with the subject of the poem. One should, however, not judge too rashly, it being sometimes doubtful whether exaggeration exists or not, as is proved by notes 82 and 87, respectively on pp. 60 and 62.

As has been observed, the author begins with a short treatise on the hyperbole. The object and matter by which a hyperbole is called forth, must possess 'an sich' something grand, powerful and extraordinary, and the poet or orator must prepare it, so to say. The various definitions of the Greek and Roman rhetors and grammarians, Gregorius Corinthius, Georgios ὁ χοιροβοσκός (probably a kind of lettered Eumaios), Kokondrios, Diomedes, Pompeius, Beda, Cicero, Julius Rufinianus et hoc genus omne, are weighed and found too light. They are all more or less at sea concerning the question of hyperboles.

The explanations given by Quintilianus, G. Hermann and G. Gerber are *melioris notae.* The chief characteristic of an hyperbole consists in exceeding the limits of truth, not with the purpose to tell falsehoods, but for the sake of making impression, of inciting the imagination. A felicitous and tastefully chosen hyperbole enhances the reader's pleasure. The conclusion, drawn by the author for the (allowed) hyperbole, is given as follows: 'Die Hyperbel ist eine an die Phantasie des Hörers (oder Lesers) appellirende, für ihn aber als solche erkennbare Uebertreibung (Steigerung) der Wahrheit, die vom Sprechenden (oder Autor) mit der bestimmten Absicht, der Ausdrucksweise Schmuck oder Kraft zu verleihen, angewendet wird, und die sowohl in ihrer Qualität als auch in der Quantität ihrer Anwendung den Gesetzen der Aesthetik unterliegt.'

Concerning the question whether the hyperbole belongs to the tropes or the figures, the author decides in general in favour of the latter. When employing a trope, we enter a new sphere of thought; the hyperbole remains in the same sphere, but this is raised to a higher level. If with the trope the proportion of the ideas is $a : b$,

it is with the hyperbole $a : a^n$. Now and then, however, when the hyperbole occurs as metaphor or as comparison, the proportion may be, like this, $a : b^n$.

After this the division of hyperboles is treated, and the opinions of Trypho, Cornificius, Quintilianus, Demetrius, Weisse, G. Hermann,[1] Gotschall, Beyer, and others are mustered, whilst the ἔμφασις, αὔξησις, ὁμοίωσις, and μείωσις are commented upon, as well as the conscious and unconscious hyperboles, the naïve (Homer) and artificial ones (Virgil). As contributions to the study of hyperboles the author mentions J. Egli, *Die Hyperbel in den Komödien des Plautus und in Cicero's Briefen an Atticus;* J. Franke, *De Silii Italici Punicorum tropis;* Spangeberg, *De Lucretii Cari tropis;* F. Dressler, *De troporum qui dicuntur apud Catullum usu;* M. Hansen, *De tropis et figuris apud Tibullum;* and H. Gebbing, *De Valerii Flacci tropis et figuris*, whilst the monographs of W. Barchfeld (Silius), L. Genther (Iuvenalis), C. H. Müller (old elegiac poets), W. Pecz' *Beiträge zur vergleichenden Tropik der Poesie, Teil I. Aeschylus, Sophocles und Euripides*, and H. Schmaus' *Tacitus ein Nachahmer Vergils* have been of use to him and have furnished him parallels. Likewise, he is indebted to two works by Oscar Brosin, *Parallelstellen aus modernen Dichtern zu Vergils Aeneis* and *Anklänge an Vergil bei Schiller* and to P. Lange's *Ueber Ronsard Franciade und ihr Verhältnis zu Vergils Aeneis.*

It is, of course, impossible to deal separately with all the places quoted by the author; I shall only mention where I do not agree with him, and where I think I am able to supply him with another instance or comparison. For the sake of gaining space, I shall not quote all passages *totidem verbis*, but only point out where they may be found. If needed, I intend to be more circumstantial.

The explanation of χ 304 given on p. 44, 'sich zu Wolken, d. h. dichtgedrängten Schwärmen duckend,' is in my opinion very hazardous—ingeniosius quam verius. When treating of this place in my dissertation *Studia Tragico-Homerica*, s.v. ἄγρη p. 52 *sq.*, I have quoted the commendable conjecture of Prof. Van Leeuwen:

τῶν μέν τ' ἐν πεδίῳ νέφεα πτώσσοντα ἵενται.

As an instance of the use of *horrere* and *horrescere* of arms like a *seges*, the verse of Ennius 'sparsis hastis longis campus splendet et horret' might have been mentioned, as well as *Georg.* i. 314, whilst besides N 339 some space might have been given to Δ 281 *sq.* and ψ 599.

To the blood-hyperboles on pp. 49 and 50 may be added Shakesp. *Macb.* ii. 2, 60 *sqq.*, *Jul. Caes.* iii. 1, 105 *sqq.*, and *Rich. II.* iii. 3, 43; to the tear-hyperboles Eur. *Alc.* 183 *sq.*, Shakesp. *Lear* iv. 6, 199 *sqq.*, *Tit. Andr.* iii. 2, 17 *sqq.*, *King John* iii. 1, 22 *sq.*, *Rich. II.* iii. 3, 162, *Rom. and Jul.* i. 1, 139, and *Lov. Compl.* 7. Where an ocean or a sea of troubles, injuries, calamities is spoken of, the following instances may be compared: Shakesp. *Haml.* iii. 1, 59, *Pericles* v. 1, 194, and *Henry VIII.* iii. 2, 360; whilst in *Oth.* i. 3, 159 there occurs 'a world of sighs' and in *Cymb.* iv. 2, 391 'a century of prayers... twice o'er.' In W. Morris' *Earthly Paradise*, 'The Story of Cupid and Psyche' we read:

Thou hast been tried, and cast away all blame
Into the sea of woes that thou dost bear.

On p. 55 a parallel to *Aen.* vi. 305 *sqq.* may be found in Milton, *P.L.* i. 298 *sqq.*, where the hosts of hell are compared to the autumnal leaves that strew the brooks in Vallombrosa, whilst in the verses immediately following they are compared to 'scattered sedge | Afloat when with fierce wind Orion armed | Hath vexed the Red Sea coast.'

The author declares ι 51 non-hyperbolical, which I venture to doubt.

In the same way I should like to put a sign of interrogation after most of his instances on p. 57. Does the author really think that these are all hyperboles consciously and purposely employed? To quote an instance from p. 58, *Buc.* i. 11 *sq.* There *totis* is considered a hyperbole; but I dare say that by *totis agris* we should understand all the fields in Meliboeus' surroundings, all the fields *he* knows of. The same remark is applicable to more instances on this page.

To the mountain-hyperboles the author might have added Shakesp. *Com. of Err.* iv. 4, extr., where 'a mountain of mad flesh' is spoken of, and *Henry IV.*[a] ii. 4, 269, where Falstaff is called 'this huge hill of flesh.' Those who wish to read some amusing scolding-hyperboles, may find them in the second act of *Troilus and Cressida.* As to the passage where Polyphemus is compared to a wooded mountain-top and passages of the same nature, we may call attention to Milton's *P.L.* i. 589 *sqq.*, where Satan stands 'proudly eminent' above the others, like

[1] In his *Dissertatio de Hyperbola.*

a tower. With *Aen.* vii. 528 *sqq.* compare Shakesp. *Henry IV.*[b] iii. 1, 21 *sqq.* and *Oth.* ii. 1, 92, and with *Aen.* x. 318, Hom. H 141. Why does not the author, in dealing with the peculiar use of *πέτομαι*, compare Soph. *Ai.* 693 and *Ant.* 1307? Where the hyperbole 'swifter than the wind' is spoken of, we may mention Shakesp. *Ven. and Ad.* 678 *sqq.* (cp. Shelley's short song from the Arabic, commencing: 'My faint spirit was sitting in the light') and where the ether and the clouds are treated of (p. 90), the opening lines of Shelley's *Skylark* might have been compared, as well as 'The Ettrick Shepherd's' lines on the same bird: 'Wild is thy lay and loud | Far in the downy cloud'...and 'Thy lay is in heaven, thy love is on earth.' Similar apostrophes to the skylark are as follows: 'Ethereal Minstrel! Pilgrim of the sky!' (Wordsworth); 'Songster of sky and cloud' (Barton); and 'Ere yet the shadows fly, he mounted sings | Amid the dawning clouds...' (Thomson, *Spring*).[1] To the hyperboles of sound may be added 'All the earth and air | With thy voice is loud' (Shelley, *Skylark*, str. 5), and to the hyperboles of thunder: Burns' *Jolly Beggars*: 'To rattle the thundering drum was his trade,' Dryden's *Power of Music*: 'the thundering drum,' and Shakesp. *King John* v. 2, 173, where the sound of the drum will 'mock the deep-mouth'd thunder,' with which passage compare *Coriol.* i. 4, 59.

Georg. ii. 324 and 364 are not so very hyperbolical in my opinion, whilst 336—339 impress one as a fantasy, in which the hyperbole does no harm to the passage, on the contrary, it enhances its power and significance.

To *Aen.* v. 695 *sq.* might have been added Ov. *Met.* xi. 517, and to *Aen.* iii. 564 *sq.* Ov. *Met.* xi. 502 *sqq.* The quotations from Silius on p. 111 may be augmented with xv. 681.

A double hyperbole of whiteness and smoothness (p. 114) occurs in Shakesp. *Oth.* v. 2, 3 *sqq.*

To the hyperboles of affection may be added Horace's 'O et praesidium et dulce decus meum,' and with the Latin *lux* in the sense of *bliss, salvation*, may be compared Hom. *π* 23 and *ρ* 41, besides Soph. *El.* 1224.

In mentioning *ἀποθνήσκειν* (p. 124) in a figurative sense, the author might have called attention to the Latin expressions *deperire alqm* and *taedio alqm enecare*, whilst on p. 125 in dealing with *Buc.* i. 38 *sq.* and Theocr. iv. 12, Moschos' *Epitaphium Bionis*, as well as Milton's *Lycidas* and Shelley's *Adonais* might have supplied the author with parallels.

Perhaps the author had better left untouched one of the most difficult lines in the *Aeneid*, viz. iv. 436, that real *crux interpretum*. The explanation quoted from Koch's *Lexicon*, p. 115, is in my opinion as unsatisfying as all the others I know of. Amongst the hyperboles of scoffing and jesting on p. 132, I think Hom. *σ* 106 may be named, where in the jeering and scornful *κοίρανος* a note of comic exaggeration is sounded; and to *Aen.* ix. 414 similar scenes from Ovid (*e.g.* the fight between Perseus and Phineus, and between the Lapithae and Centaurs) might have been added.

In dealing with *occidere* (*Aen.* xi. 413) the use of *perii* might have been commented upon, and Soph. *Ai.* 896 have been adduced as a parallel.

According to the author (p. 140) *Georg.* ii. 172 contains a greater compliment to the Indians than to the Romans, but may we not assume *imbellem* to be used here proleptically?

In order not to overtax the reader's patience, I shall abstain from further particulars, and only add that at the end of his book the author gives an aesthetic appreciation of Virgil's epic, in which he states as his opinion that its merits have been often overvalued, and that it stands far beneath Homer's *Iliad*. I dare say Mr. Hunziker is in the main right, when he judges Virgil as follows on p. 143: 'In dem richtigen, aber vielleicht unbewussten Gefühle, dass ihm wirkliche epische Begabung fehle, hat Vergil eine ganz besondere Sorgfalt auf die Sprache verwendet; er wollte seine Schwächen durch das ausgefeilte Pathos verdecken, und so schwelgt er in einer pathetisch gehobenen Diction, um möglichst episch zu erscheinen, tut aber dabei meiner Ansicht nach des Guten viel zu viel, so dass man seine Redeweise oft mit Recht schwülstig, unklar, übertrieben und daher langweilig nennen kann; wir sehnen uns bei der Lectüre der Aeneis zurück zu dem einfachen Heldengesang Homers, der von echt künstlerischer—und nicht künstlicher Schönheit durchtränkt ist, und der nie durch eine grossrednerische Sprache das Fehlen eines bedeutenden Inhalts bemänteln muss.'

EDWARD B. KOSTER.

The Hague, Holland.

[1] Cp. Shakesp. Song in *Cymbeline*: 'Hark! hark! the lark at heaven's gate sings' and Sonnet XXIX.

CARTAULT ON VIRGIL'S *BUCOLICS*.

Étude sur les Bucoliques de Virgile, par A. CARTAULT, professeur de la poésie latine à l'Université de Paris. Paris: Colin. Pp. viii. + 507, small 8. 5 francs.

M. CARTAULT divides his subject into thirteen chapters. In the first two he discusses the early life and friends of Virgil and the chronology of the Eclogues: he then devotes one chapter to each Eclogue in turn and concludes with a thirteenth on the 'rustic realities' of the poems. His object is not to describe the broad literary aspects of the Eclogues but to examine them minutely somewhat in the manner of a commentator: he requires his readers to keep the text of Virgil before them for frequent reference, and he enumerates recent German theories with something very like German fulness. His book is not meant to be read continuously, like, for instance, Mr. Sellar's Virgil but to be consulted by close students of the Eclogues.

It may be consulted, I believe, with much profit. M. Cartault combines literary taste, scholarship, knowledge, and sound judgment, and his pages are interesting and suggestive. He is at his best, perhaps, when he is indicating the relation of Virgil to Theocritus, and one wishes that he had somewhere collected into one chapter the remarks on this subject which are at present scattered up and down his book. He deals ably, too, with the German views which he enumerates—with the result (as might have been expected) that most of them are found to be untenable. I am not sure that all these theories really deserved discussion: many are so arbitrary that they are best left alone. But M. Cartault's conspectus of them has a certain, perhaps a melancholy, interest, and it is well done.

I pass on to notice one or two points about which I am not in agreement with M. Cartault. In the first place, he accepts the theory that Virgil, like other poets, composed various fragments on chance occasions and used them afterwards when writing complete Eclogues. The idea is natural and attractive: the difficulty seems to me to arise when it is applied to any individual case. For example, M. Cartault holds that a passage in the ninth Eclogue (vv. 46–50),

ecce, Dionaei processit Caesaris astrum

and its context, were written at the moment when the *Iulium sidus* actually appeared in 44, and were utilized for the ninth Eclogue in 38 or 39. The suggestion is interesting, for it makes out that Vergil was a Caesarian in 44, and not, like Horace, a late convert; but I do not see how it can possibly be proved. The lines plainly refer to an event of 44, but that event had plainly not been forgotten in 38 or whenever the eclogue, as a whole, was composed: they might therefore have been written when the rest of the Eclogue was written, and I can detect no reason for supposing that they were not written at that time. M. Cartault's hypothesis, therefore, is superfluous, and is devoid of confirmatory evidence; it is simply possible and nothing more. I hasten to add that M. Cartault rarely indulges in such a hypothesis and that when I protest against it, I do not mean to imply that it is characteristic of his volume.

I take a different kind of point for my next criticism. M. Cartault comments on a well-known difficulty in the first Eclogue

rapidum Cretae veniemus Oaxen.

He is inclined to read by conjecture *ad axem* for *oaxen*, but he is ready to accept *Cretae*, which seems to me inadmissible. The context states that the exiled speaker and his companions in misfortune will go to Britain or Scythia or the Sahara, that is to the outskirts of the world known to the Romans. It is absurd to append to these places the island of Crete. M. Cartault observes that 'il n'est pas plus extraordinaire d'aller en Crète que d'aller en Bretagne,' but I think he wrote the sentence in haste. Britain was to the Roman of Virgil's day proverbially one of the ends of the earth: Crete was close to Italy and a Roman Province: the two are absolutely dissimilar. Whatever, then, be the right explanation of the line, *Cretae* must be wrong. There is, on the other hand, a well-attested reading, *rapidum cretae*, and there is a river Oaxes in the East, apparently in Scythia, and it is simplest to accept these facts or to confess ignorance. Conjecture is very unlikely to help us here, or, indeed, in most parts of Virgil.

I would not, however, be supposed to be criticising M. Cartault's book unfavourably, because of the two preceding paragraphs. It contains much in detail which is acceptable or at least stimulating, and I hope that it will receive from Virgilian scholars the attention which I believe it to deserve.

F. HAVERFIELD.

RIDLEY'S TRANSLATION OF LUCAN'S *PHARSALIA*.

The Pharsalia of Lucan, translated into blank verse by EDMUND RIDLEY, Q.C.[1] Longmans, 1896, pp. xviii. 334. 14*s*.

IT is somewhat of a paradox that the year of grace 1896 should have brought to the birth a verse translation of the *Pharsalia*. But Mr. Ridley's poetical manner is not that of his contemporaries and recalls the eighteenth much more than the nineteenth century. So far well. He has not adopted the rhymed couplet of Dryden and Pope; but in that his choice appears to be, in the abstract, right. There are, it is true, passages whose double antithesis rebels against all the efforts of a blank verse translation. Such a passage is the famous

magno se iudice quisque tuetur;
uictrix causa deis placuit sed uicta Catoni,

rendered by Mr. Ridley,

'Each for his cause can vouch a judge supreme,
'The victor, heaven; the vanquished, Cato, thee,'

where a less inadequate version would be,

For either cause a judge most high can boast,
Heaven for the conquering, Cato for the lost.[2]

But after all, translation in verse is but a choice of sacrifices; and the translator who takes upon himself the chains of rhyme pays a heavy price for their glitter and clang. For the rest, it will be well to begin by giving a specimen of the rendering where it is most successful. I will take this from the episode of the Witch of Thessaly in book VI:

Angered at Death the witch, and at the pause
Conceded by the fates, with living snake
Scourges the moveless corse; and on the dead
She barks through fissures gaping to her song,
Breaking the silence of their gloomy home:
'Tisiphone, Megæra, heed ye not?
'Flies not this wretched soul before your whips
'The void of Erebus? By your very names
'She-dogs of hell, I'll call you to the day,
'Not to return; through sepulchres and death
'Your gaoler: from funereal urns and tombs
'I'll chase you forth. And thou, too, Hecatè,
'Who to the gods in comely shape and mien,
'Not that of Erebus, appearst, henceforth
'Wasted and pallid as thou art in hell
'At my command shalt come. I'll noise abroad
'The banquet that beneath the solid earth
'Holds thee, thou maid of Enna; by what bond
'Thou lov'st night's king, by what mysterious stain
'Infected, so that Ceres fears from hell
'To call her daughter. And for thee, base king,
'Titan shall pierce thy caverns with his rays
'And sudden day shall smite thee. Do ye hear?
'Or shall I summon to mine aid that god
'At whose dread name earth trembles; who can look
'Unflinching on the Gorgon's head, and drive
'The Furies with his scourge, who holds the depths
'Ye cannot fathom, and above whose haunts
'Ye dwell supernal; who by waves of Styx
'Forswears himself unpunished?'

There are undoubtedly faults in this version. The fifth line dilutes the original 'regnique silentia rumpit' too much. It may be doubted whether an ordinary English reader would understand the Latinism in 'Flies...the void of Erebus' for 'Flies *over* the void'; the same perhaps may be said of 'very names' which is to be the opposite of 'assumed names.' The sense of 'per busta sequar, per funera custos' has been missed; and I think it would hardly be inferred from the now conventional expression 'earth trembles' that the utterance of the dread name produced an earthquake. But taken as a whole the passage

[1] Appointed, since this review was written, one of Her Majesty's judges.

[2] I should at once say that the versions of my own which here and there in this article I have appended to my criticisms of Mr. Ridley are not designed to be corrections of his translation, to which in many cases they could not be applied, still less as model renderings, but to indicate more briefly than description could do the points at which I think a translator of the passages should aim.

is well rendered; and if the same level had been maintained throughout, we should have before us a good translation of the *Pharsalia*.

This however is not the case. The chief cause would appear to be that Mr. Ridley has not fully and consciously realized the scope and conditions of the work. A translation of Latin poetry into English can never afford to neglect the fact that the difference between prosaic and poetical expression is far greater in the modern than in the ancient language. The Roman poets were well aware of the difficulties which their language threw in the path of the Muse, when they tried every expedient, legitimate or illegitimate, to differentiate her utterance from the *sermo pedestris*. 'Hordea qui dixit superest ut tritica dicat' is a severe, though a just stricture, upon the devices adopted for this purpose by even the more illustrious of Roman poetical writers. Plurals like *mella*, collective singulars like *cadauer* are of course untranslateable; but the version which, *without compensation*, suppresses them, is unfaithful to the style of its original. When we turn to metre, we find the case reversed. Every one is aware that English prosaists often drop unconsciously into blank verse; but a hexameter in the Roman orators and historians is a veritable phenomenon. Modern verse has called in the aid of rhyme to supplement the deficiencies of metre; and if rhyme be dispensed with, its place must be taken by a mastery over the simple metre which but few can claim. Wherever then a version in its language and in its handling of an unrhyming metre fails to reproduce relatively the distance between poetry and prose, it must be pronounced poetically inadequate; and this I fear is the case with much of Mr. Ridley's work. There is however a great deal in Lucan which in respect of thought and expression cannot be distinguished from prose, and here we can only require from the translator the prosewriter's merits of vehemence, vigour and epigram. It must be confessed that here too Mr. Ridley's translation leaves a good deal to be desired.

These criticisms may now be illustrated by extracts. In book II. of the Marian massacres Lucan has (104 *sqq.*)

nulli sua profuit aetas :
non senis extremum piguit uergentibus annis
praecipitasse diem, nec primo in limine uitae
infantis miseri nascentia rumpere fata'

'No age found pity: men of failing years,
Just tottering to the grave, were hurled to death.
From infants, in their being's earliest dawn,
The growing life was severed.'

Now if this is the best that can be done with Lucan in English, Mr. Ridley has condemned himself from the first to plough the sand; for no one would read it. But Ben Jonson's imitation, which is quoted in Mr. Ridley's footnote, indicates the truer method:

Cethegus.—Not infants in the porch of life were free.

Lucan says of the Caesarians asleep after the battle of Pharsalia 'capuloque manus absente mouentur' (VII. 767). This is translated:

'The guilty hand
Still wrought its deeds of blood, *and restless sought*
The absent sword-hilt[1].'

Now apart from the mistranslation of 'mouentur,' which appears to come from Haskins' note, the literalism of 'absent swordhilt' fails completely to convey the weird effect, involved in the Latin expression, of an action severed from its object; compare Virgil's famous phrase 'illum *absens absentem* auditque uidetque.' We might propose,

The sword-hand sways,
Clutching a hilt of dreams.

Further on we read

'No lowing kine should graze, nor shepherd dare
To leave his fleecy charge to browse at will
On fields made fertile by our mouldering dust;
All bare and unexplored thy soil should lie
As past man's footsteps, parched by cruel suns,
Or palled by snows unmelting!'

This is to translate

gregibus dumeta carerent
nullusque auderet pecori permittere pastor,
uellere surgentem de nostris ossibus herbam,
ac uelut impatiens hominum, uel solis iniqui
limite uel glacie, nuda atque ignota iaceres.

[1] Italics are of course mine.

Little fault can be found with the last words if we allow that this is the place to render *glacie* by three-fifths of a line in English. But what of the rest? Does it preserve any feature characteristic of its original? 'Fleecy charge.' It would be curious to know Lucan's opinion of *fleecy charge*.

A little while before we have to translate,

has trahe, Caesar, aquas; hoc, si potes, utere caelo,

'Drink, Caesar, of the streams
Drink, if thou can'st, and *should it be thy wish*,
Breathe the Thessalian air.'

This mild apostrophe might have been addressed to a Wordsworthian lamb. 'Drink, pretty creature, drink!' The Nemesis is a fitting one for an unnecessary diffuseness.

Drink of these waters, Caesar, draw this air.
Thou can'st not!

The beginning of book V., the first lines of which are well translated, furnishes an example of how Lucan's force may be dissipated without much exceeding the length of the original:

When all were silent, from his lofty seat
Thus Lentulus began, while stern and sad
The Fathers listened: 'If your hearts still beat
With Latian blood, and if within your breasts
Still lives your fathers' vigour, look not now
On this strange land that holds us, nor enquire
Your distance from the captured city.'—

ut primum maestum tenuere silentia coetum,
Lentulus e celsa sublimis sede profatur:
'Indole si dignum Latia, si sanguine prisco
robur inest animis, non qua tellure coacti
quamque procul tectis captae sedeamus ab urbis,
cernite.' (15 *sqq.*)

Here the fullness of expression in 16 and again in the next line is simply the Latin mode of giving clearness and emphasis and does not concern the English translator, who should keep the space he will thus save for other needs.

We might render

When hushed the gloomy concourse, high enthroned
Spake Lentulus: 'If mighty through your veins
Still surge old Latium's blood, ye will not look
What strange land gathers us, how far we sit
From towers and temples of the captive town.

'May he be conqueror who shall not draw
Against the vanquished an inhuman sword,
Nor count it as a crime if men of Rome
Preferred another's standard to his own.'
VII. 370 *sqq.* = 312 *sqq.*

There is nothing poetical in the original here; but this is weak prose. So with the line just above.

'For this hostile chief
Is savage Sulla's pupil.'

cum duce Sullano gerimus ciuilia bella 307

Tis civil war, and yon a Sullan chief!

Nothing is less epic than epigram; and Lucan's mots are a sore trial to the translator. Mr. Ridley however, sometimes puts himself at a needless disadvantage by not observing that where the original ends with a line, the translation must do so too:

quicquid multis peccatur inultum est V.260,

For justice sleeps when thousands share the sin,

loses all its force if thus divided,

'When thousands share the guilt
Crime goes unpunished.'

I have pointed out that in a number of instances Mr. Ridley has missed the meaning of his author. It is fair therefore to add that in one place at least (VII. 699 *sq.*) he alone, so far as I know, has seen the truth through the misleading vulgate punctuation which I regret to say I allowed to stand in my recent edition of the book. The note of interrogation should be placed after *nefas*, not after *cateruas*, and a comma inserted after *respice*.

Though high praise cannot be awarded to this translation, we may still be glad

that it has been executed. For without the offset of metre, as the present reviewer knows from dreary experience, Lucan is intolerable when translated; and we may freely grant that the modest wish which concludes the preface of Mr. Ridley's book has been realized, 'I shall be more than satisfied if I have done anything to render the 'Pharsalia' in language, manner and thought more accessible than it has hitherto been to English readers.'

J. P. P.

MOLHUYSEN ON MSS. OF THE *ODYSSEY*.

De tribus Homeri Odysseae codicibus antiquissimis scripsit P. C. Molhuysen, Litt. Hum. Dr.: accedunt tabulae quinque. Lugduni-Batavorum. A. W. Sijthoff. MDCCCXCVI. Mark 4.20.

In a short preface Dr. Molhuysen explains his reasons for collating G (Mediceus Laurentianus xxxii. 24 saec. x.), F (Florentinus Laurentianus Conv. Soppr. 52, saec. xi.), and P (Palatinus Heidelbergensis 45, anno 1201):—G had never been completely collated, and Ludwich's collations of F and P betrayed inaccuracy and want of skill. Pp. 3-32 are occupied with Prolegomena to the collation of GFP *cum A. Ludwichii editione*. The abbreviations used are explained pp. 153-4. Then follow *corrigenda* and five facsimiles, viz. G ϕ 399-423, F τ 63-83, and, to show the two chief of the four contemporary hands, P η 96-126, ω 543-548 *cum subscriptione*, and *Batrachomyomachiae finis cum subscriptione*.

The collation of G, the first of its kind, needs no apology; and of Ludwich's collation of F and P our author writes p. 30: 'talia menda inveni ut libere dicere audeam, Ludwichium non ea esse in legendis libris manuscriptis peritia ut scriptorem ad fidem codicum edere possit.' Certainly the mistakes alleged, pp. 30-32, are sufficient to destroy the authority of any *apparatus criticus*. Some of them one may judge for oneself by consulting the facsimiles: to these may be added τ 67 *ὀπιπεύεις* F according to the facsimile, but Ludwich has turned the present into the future. How serious the divergence between the two collations may be is evident δ 547. According to Ludwich the readings of our three MSS. are *κτείναι* G, *κτείνη* p.c. P^2 [and presumably *κτεῖνεν* F as in the text], but Molhuysen gives *κτείναι* G, *κτεῖνεν* F p.c. P^2, *κτάνεν* a.c. P, *κτείνει* p.c. P^2. In short it certainly seems that the authority has vanished of what was our best *apparatus criticus* of the *Odyssey*; though it will always remain to the credit of Prof. Ludwich, that he so drew attention to these three codices, as to impel Dr. Molhuysen to give us the new collations. But one's faith in collations is sorely shaken, and, if collations of texts can be so faulty, what are we to think of our editions of scholia?

Even the new collation leaves room for criticism. Many orthographical details have been intentionally (p. 28) and, no doubt for the most part, rightly omitted. But one would have gladly been explicitly informed by Dr. Molhuysen, whether α 222 *νώνυμνον* is read by GFP though Ludwich failed to find it, or, though GFP read like all other MSS. *νώνυμον*, the mis-spelling was thought too unimportant to be mentioned. So too Molhuysen may very reasonably have agreed with Cauer, *Grundfragen d. hom. Textkritik*, p. 58, that δ 672 *ναυτίλεται* F is worthless as external evidence for the aorist demanded by Paech and Curtius; but it is to be regretted that the reading of F here is simply ignored. Similarly, according to Ludwich and, so far as I can read it, Molhuysen's facsimile, P reads η 107 *καιροσσέων* with *-σσ-*. If so, it is to be regretted that the collation is silent on the matter in view of Bergk's emendation *καιρουσσέων* and the inferences drawn from it:—'if we suppose that in an Athenian[1] copy of the *Odyssey* ΚΑΙΡΟΣΕΟΝ was written,...it is easy to understand, how a copyist unacquainted with the rare adjective *καιρόεις* made a form *καιροσέων* out of the letters which he did not understand' (Cauer, *l.l.* p. 76). The double *-σ-* of P is hardly a mere freak of that MS. since it appears in Et. Mg. 499. 43, though see 498. 7, and has only been removed by emendation from Hesychius (see Schmidt, larger edition).

The Prolegomena, after the necessary description of the MSS., show how the

[1] Why Athenian? The Ionian alphabet, as it slowly developed, passed through its *μεταχαρακτηρισμός* in respect to single for double letters, and O=*o* or *ου*: cf. Cauer, *Del.*² 480 (Teos), 486 (Miletos), 491 (Halicarnassos), 496 (Chios), 503 (Samos), 516 (Naxos, *αλησν*=*ἀλλέων*), etc.

copyists have corrupted the texts, for (p. 29) the chief aim of palaeography should be to show us '*quid in emendando scriptore licitum sit.*' The verses omitted by G, F, or P are discussed severally, and 'haplographia' is illustrated in a very interesting manner. Also of great interest are the illustrations, p. 23, of the effect of the copyists knowing Homer too well: they often substituted the words of a similar verse for what was before them.

All three MSS. are shown to be copies of codices in minuscule script. It is noteworthy that G generally accents *κήρυξ* p. 28 n. (see Chandler, *Gk. Accent.* § 622), and in the dat. pl. and infin. writes more often than other MSS. *κώπησ'*, *ἔμμεν'* and the like, p. 29, and 'fere semper' (see on *α* 170) *εἶσ'*. These elisions must be traceable to the influence of grammatical theories; why *εἶσ'*? *εισι* is a *vox nihili*, and we can hardly refer back to a time when the MSS. had ΕΣ = *ἐσσ'*. But the critical signs in G are probably due to the copyist. At least this is Molhuysen's view as to the antisigma (p. 4), and I think it may also apply to the asterisks, which are ascript to *α* 97-102. The scribe of G seems to have known Homer very well (see Molhuysen, p. 23, and cf. *γ* 106, 109) and, as all these lines recur, he may have written the asterisk against them on that account: cf. the explanation of this sign by some grammarian in Dindorf, *Schol. in Il.* I. xliv. In favour of this view is the circumstance that the asterisks are ascript, not merely to vv. 97-101, which were rejected by Aristarchus, but to v. 102 (= *ω* 488, B 167, Ω 121, etc.), which was not and could not be rejected.

It may be worth while to point out that the same MS. preserves a probably unique and ancient form in *β* 63 *ἄσχετα* = *ἄνσχετα*: cf. similar forms discussed by Schulze, *Quaest. Ep.* 44 n. Another trace of ancient 'Sandhi' may be found in the reading of GFP *α* 93 *ἐσπάρτην*, with which cf. *εστηλην* = *ἐς στ.* Cauer *Del.*[2] 483, and see Smyth, *Ionic* p. 598.

One cannot but hope that what Dr. Molhuysen has done for GFP may be done by him or by other palaeographists for other important MSS. such as M, and that on the basis of such improved collations some competent person may attempt to show the relation of our MSS. to one another[1] and to the learned editions of antiquity, and to estimate the value of any single important MS., in the several parts of the poem, as evidence for or against a given reading. I say, in the several parts, for inasmuch as a single huge roll of papyrus containing the whole *Odyssey* must have always been a rarity, it is therefore probable that the codices were put together from a number of *libelli* often of different origin. At present a reading peculiar to one MS. or to a minority, however old, has only so far the advantage over a modern conjecture, that it is less likely to be a mere conjecture, though it may be due to misreading, or mere carelessness. If such a reading is adopted, as *e.g.* *δ* 672 *ναντίλεται* is put into the text by Monro (cf. his preface 'pristinam Graecae linguae formam aucupari...noluimus...multis tamen lectionibus ex apparatu critico Arturi Ludwich...desumptis'), then the editor's justification is not the slight external evidence, which at present one cannot evaluate, but the fitness of the reading, its congruity with epic usage, and the probability of its having been the parent or at least the antecedent of the common reading. So, too, the reading of the Genevese papyrus (J. Nicole, *Rev. de Philologie*, 1894, p. 102) *γ* 372

θάμβησε δὲ λαὸς Ἀχαιῶν
θαύμασ<σ>εν δ' ὁ γεραιός

instead of

θάμβος δ' ἕλε πάντας ἰδόντας
θαύμαζεν δ' ὁ γεραιός

is an indeterminate quantity for us, if we consider it as external evidence against the vulgate. We stand in the same relation to the readings of the scholia. Conservatives and radicals alike act on the principle laid down by Van Leeuwen and Mendes, *Ilias*, p. xxii.: 'singulis locis quid sit legendum non codices grammaticorumve notulae docere nos possunt, sed dictionis epicae leges ex ipso Homero cognitae.' *Apparatus critici* and scholia are chiefly or merely valuable as collections of suggested emendations.

In this matter a review of the MSS. by one skilled in palaeography may render great service. For instance, all known MSS. of the *Odyssey* read *καὶ* for *κατὰ* in *δ* 72. The result is a construction too contorted for it to be probable that the error was deliberately spread by interpolation into texts which preserved *κατὰ*. Should we refer all our MSS. of *δ* to a single copy? and was the error due to reading *κ᾽* as *κ′*, signs which denote the preposition and conjunction respectively in the papyrus of the Constitution of Athens? The true reading was

[1] See now *Odyssea I.*[2], edd. Van Leeuwen et Mendes.

preserved as late as the time of schol. T on Ω 323. Something too might be done by one well acquainted with the scholia. For example, on working through the scholia cited by Ludwich AHT i. pp. 46-7 as examples of the terms *αἱ εἰκαιότεραι, χαριέστεραι* and the like, it will be found that GFP tend to agree with one another and with the 'inferior' editions or copies: viz: γ 349, ε 232, ξ 428, τ 83 GFP have the reading of the 'inferior' versions, but α 117 P and β 182 GF diverge. Again GFP differ from the 'more exquisite' versions β 170, ζ 291, η 74, ο 268, but γ 151 FP and λ 196 G agree with them. All this seems to show that our MS. tradition has preserved a text little influenced by Alexandrian criticism.

C. M. Mulvany.

FRANKLIN'S *TRACES OF EPIC INFLUENCE IN THE TRAGEDIES OF AESCHYLUS.*

Traces of Epic Influence in the Tragedies of Aeschylus. A Dissertation presented to the Faculty of Bryn Mawr College for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy by S. B. Franklin. Baltimore, 1895.

Dr. Franklin takes as the text of her thesis the well-known saying attributed to Aeschylus, *τὰς αὐτοῦ τραγῳδίας τεμάχη εἶναι τῶν Ὁμήρου μεγάλων δείπνων*, and examines the Aeschylean plays for traces of Homeric influence in epic forms, in epic vocabulary, and in syntax, subject-matter and style. She finds, as was to be expected, that Homer exercised a strong influence upon the tragedian, both in style and diction and in subject matter. Her work is, on the whole, carefully done, although her lists of parallel passages and word-forms might have been considerably enlarged. The subject of the thesis was evidently too broad, and might have been divided with profit. I have noted, also, a few misstatements: *e.g.* it is hardly true that *μοῦνος* is 'quite frequent in the other tragedians' (p. 11), for in Euripides it is decidedly rare, and in *I. T.* 157 and *Alc.* 122 it rests upon conjecture. The author seems, also, to attribute a somewhat disproportionate importance to Paley's Aeschylus, excellent as that edition is in many respects. On p. 25, note 4 the rule for position before *muta cum liquida* is not clearly stated and needs qualification. Still, the work is in the main meritorious, and might with advantage be expanded into a larger and more comprehensive treatise. The English in which it is written is occasionally somewhat slipshod.

H. W. Hayley.

Middletown, Connecticut.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

HEAD'S *CATALOGUE OF GREEK COINS.*

Catalogue of Greek Coins in the British Museum. Caria, Cos, Rhodes, &c. By Barclay V. Head, D.C.L. 28*s.*

A fresh volume of the British Museum Catalogue of Coins is always welcome, and is sure to contain valuable information. But Caria is scarcely one of the more interesting parts of the Greek world. The islands and a few towns of the coast began to issue money early, but most Carian cities begin to mint only in the Hellenistic age or even later. Thus the light derived from the coins falls mostly on unhistoric days and local cults, rather than on the highways of history. The local cults of Caria have considerable attraction; but the present is scarcely a fitting place for their discussion; therefore we do not propose to examine the volume at length, but only to note a few points.

The coins issued by the Carian Dynasts, Hecatomnus and Mausolus with Milesian types, were attributed by Mr. Head in the Catalogue of Ionia to Miletus: in the present volume he assigns them to Mylasa, but without giving detailed reasons for the change of attribution. The question however has some historic interest, and perhaps required discussion.

Mr. Head well points out that the so-called Rhodian standard of weight (drachm

about 60 grains) did not originate at Rhodes, but at Chios. He thinks that in origin it was a reduction of the Attic standard (drachm 67·5 grains). It occurs to me that it may be not impossibly derived from the standard of the electrum of Cyzicus, which was in use at least as early as B.C. 500.

I may make one or two other suggestions. A hunter charging a boar on a coin of Aphrodisias (Pl. VIII. 4, p. 50) is identified as Adonis. This seems unlikely, as the death of Adonis, not his hunting, is the governing fact. A closely similar figure on the coins of Ephesus is identified by Mr. Head as Androclus, and some such identification would better suit here also. At p. lxxiii. the countermark ⊙EOY on imperial coins of Stratonicea is taken to prove that they were 'guaranteed by the authorities of a temple.' I should prefer to regard the countermark as shewing that they were dedicated in a temple, and thus stamped to prevent their further circulation. At p. 260 the Gorgon-head on the coins of Gorgus at Rhodes is thus described 'Head of Helios or Medusa (?), with winged diadem tied beneath chin.' A more accurate description would be 'Head of Medusa, winged, with snakes tied at throat.' Certainly no diadem appears in the plate (XLV. 3).

However I will not further discuss details, though archaeology differs from law in caring for the smallest detail. To speak of the soundness and accuracy of Mr. Head's work would be superfluous, since these qualities are allowed to it not only in England, but in every University and Academy of Europe. Since the publication of his *Coinage of Syracuse* in 1874 he has not ceased to pour out volume after volume of valuable researches in Greek Numismatics; and the highest praise that can be bestowed on the present volume is that it is worthy to stand beside the rest.

PERCY GARDNER.

MONTHLY RECORD.

ITALY.

Rondissone, Piedmont.—A curious glass vessel in the form of a swan has been found here; it appears to have been a child's toy, perhaps used as a rattle. These objects are rare but not unknown; another, now destroyed, is said to have been found with that here described, together with a coin of Domitian. The vessel is completely closed up, but is broken at the tail.[1]

Cologna, Venetia.—Fibulae of various types have recently been found here, belonging to the Euganean and Roman epochs. Among them may be mentioned a boat-shaped fibula with long sheath-like foot; on the bow are three small figures of monkeys drinking; another boat-shaped fibula with ten rings along the bow, to which a chain is attached. Other bronze objects have also come to light, including pendants, part of a belt with incised spirals like those in Mycenaean work and rosettes in circles, a knife with elegant handle, and the handles of a situla.[1]

Basciano (Piceuum).—A tomb of pre-historic date has been discovered, which contained a fibula of exceptional size, of the type known as 'leaf-shaped with disc.' The bow is in the form of a flat oval disc with incised chevron-patterns; the foot ends in an elliptical piece on which are incised elaborate systems of lines in squares. In the same tomb were found four discs of bronze with simple incised patterns.[1]

Bacucco (Picenum).—A small terra-cotta altar has been found with relief representing a contest between a Greek and an Amazon. A similar altar has been found at Atri in the same neighbourhood. In this locality has also been found a fibula of the simplest and earliest type, like a modern safety-pin.[1]

Tortoreto (Picenum).—Two interesting terra-cottas have recently been found here; both are antefixal ornaments. The first represents a slave with comic mask, in a pensive attitude, resting one hand on an amphora; on the other side of him is a palm-branch. The other is in the form of a nude youth, rather corpulent, who plays the double flute; on either side of him is an amphora. It perhaps represents a *nannus*.[1]

Arezzo.—Some finds of interesting Aretine vases have lately been made. They are stamped with the names of Saturninus M. Perennis and Crescentis M. Perennis; other specimens of evidently later date bear the names of Bargates and M. Tigranes. Among the subjects represented may be mentioned: (1) a man with a comic mask, another with an ass's head; and a third with a bearded old man's mask; (2) man with comic mask, dancer in grotesque attitude, and man running away, carrying a strainer; (3) a man of monkey-like appearance, and another lying covered up on a couch. Other fragments bear similar subjects.[2]

Bolsena.—Some interesting specimens of the late *vasi dorati* (or *inargentati*) with figures in relief have lately come to light. They resemble a group of vases from Bolsena now in the Brit. Mus. (*Cat.* G 179–194). The best specimen is a krater with masks and figures repeated two or three times, representing Athena and Odysseus, Herakles and a woman, Zeus (?), bearded, with cornucopia, and Hera (?), with sceptre. It is almost identical with the vase G 180 in the Brit. Mus. Part of another vase had heads of Herakles and Hera (compare coins of Hirina); and an askos with heads of Medusa may also be mentioned. Fragments of four Campanian phialae with reliefs of Herakles and Omphale also came to light.[3]

Poggio Sommavilla (Sabini).—An interesting necropolis has been investigated. It contained bucchero vases and other local fabrics, as well as Greek vases, some proto-Corinthian, others (kylikes) of the black figure period. Among the local specimens some are curious, *e.g.* a large spherical *olla* on which are incised two figures of winged horses; a covered amphora stamped with a frieze of rude horses; a similar amphora with two friezes of horses, some led by men, interspersed with anchors (?); and a small flask of curious shape, the sides folded over like an opening bud; on either side is a bird within a twisted ring, and on the neck are inscriptions in early Italian characters.[2]

H. B. WALTERS.

[1] *Notizie degli Scavi*, Dec. 1896.

[2] *Notizie degli Scavi*, Nov. 1896.

[3] *Notizie degli Scavi*, Oct. 1896.

The Classical Review

JULY 1897.

THE EUROPEAN EXPEDITION OF DARIUS.

§ 1. HARDLY any episode in the work of Herodotus succumbs more easily to negative criticism than that of the Scythian expedition of Darius; and in none perhaps has positive criticism found more difficulty in attempting to discover the historical foundations of the fiction. Our only chances of reaching the truth lie in the fortunate fact that Herodotus, here as in other cases, put together his tale from different sources, and, with that artlessness which is one of his charms, did not take the pains to disguise the patchwork. This is the normal procedure of Herodotus and renders his work eminently amenable to historical criticism, within certain limits. It is generally possible, when there is any historical ground under our feet, to discover an incongruity which lets out the main secret. Nor will this method fail us, as I believe, in the case of the Persian expedition beyond the Danube.

Recently the text of the Scythian episode has been submitted to a thorough-going analysis by Mr. Macan,[1] and illustrated by four most useful comparative maps, showing the various conceptions of Scythia implied by the author. I shall have occasion to refer frequently to Mr. Macan's work in the course of this paper, but at the outset I would acknowledge my indebtedness to his investigations, which I have found, as always, most suggestive.

§ 2. Having passed through Thrace and subjugated the Thracian peoples, who, except the Getae are said to have offered no opposition, Darius meets his Greek fleet on the Ister, presumably at the neck, near Galatz, where it divides into 'five' mouths. Up to this point, says Grote,[2] 'our narrative runs smoothly and intelligibly: we know that Darius marched his army into Scythia, and that he came back with ignominy and severe loss. But as to all which happened between his crossing and recrossing the Danube, we find nothing approaching to authentic statement, nor even what we can set forth as the probable basis of truth on which exaggerating fancy has been at work—all is inexplicable mystery.' Herodotus 'conducts the immense host of Darius as it were through fairyland—heedless of distance, large intervening rivers, want of all cultivation or supplies, destruction of the country (in so far as it could be destroyed) by the retreating Scythians &c.' Not the meanest of the miracles which the story implies is the rapid organization and active cooperation of so many Scythian peoples over such a vast area—a feat which would be only possible under the empire of an Attila or a Zenghis.

§ 3. The story of this wild goose chase to the banks of unknown rivers beyond the Don is no longer mistaken for history by the least critical authority. But it is not superfluous to insist that it is futile and foolish to compromise with it; for the compromise is merely a guess. It is useless to suggest that, though Darius certainly did not approach the Don, he advanced to the Dnieper, or that, though he did not get to the Dnieper, he may have halted on the banks of the Bug, or that, if the Bug is out of the question he

[1] In App. II. 'Geography of Scythia,' and App. III. 'The Date, Motives, and Course of the Expedition of Dareios in Europe,' in *Herodotus*, Vol. II.

[2] IV. p. 190-1.

at least reached the Dniester.[1] All such suggestions are purely arbitrary; and that is objection enough. But apart from that, they are all forbidden by one general consideration. *It is not legitimate to assume a march eastward in any shape*; for instance, as Curtius suggested, with the object of opening up new trade routes along the coast. *For any such assumption involves the accompaniment of the army by the fleet; and*, if there is one fact which was clearly primary in the sources of Herodotus, it was that *the fleet did not sail beyond the Ister*. It should be remembered that the cooperation of army and navy was an invariable principle of Persian warfare in the west. We see it stringently applied in the expedition of Mardonius, and in the invasion of Xerxes.

§ 4. When the Scythian Walpurgis-nacht is left out of the play, our view of the European expedition of Darius is entirely transformed. The great result of that expedition was the reduction of Thrace,[2] roughly accomplished by Darius, completed by Megabazus. In Herodotus, Thrace is merely the passage to Scythia; the conquest of Thrace is a business merely subsidiary to the main business, the conquest of Scythia. When the design of conquering Scythia turns out to be a fable, the feat of conquering Thrace begins to assume different proportions. The necessary and obvious inference is that the object of Darius was the conquest of Thrace, and that, instead of Thrace being merely the preface to Scythia, Scythia, whatever is left of it, was the appendix to Thrace. And we may add that, as Herodotus has exaggerated the work of Darius beyond the Danube into fabulous dimensions, so he has underrated his work in Thrace. He represents the reduction of the warlike Thracian tribes as 'a walk over.' All submit except the Getae, the most warlike, who *πρὸς ἀγνωμοσύνην τραπόμενοι αὐτίκα ἐδουλώθησαν*. We do not know how much may lie behind this statement and we may seriously question the exact significance of the summary *αὐτίκα*. Herodotus is fearfully impatient to leave the history which he did not know, to get to the fiction of which he knew so much.

Another important and related corollary from the collapse of the Scythian fable is that the primary purpose of the fleet was not—as in that fable—to transport the army across the Danube, but to support the army in the reduction of Thrace.

§ 5. It would be wrong to infer, however, that Darius did not cross the Danube at all. The application of historical method to our data enables us to conclude with certainty that he did.[3] There cannot be much doubt that Herodotus, as Bishop Thirlwall suggested, derived his story of the action of the Greek trierarchs on the Danube, when they were tempted to leave the Great King in the lurch, from the tradition preserved in the family of Miltiades. It can be proved indeed that this tradition distorted facts for the purpose of representing Miltiades as a patriotic Hellene; it can be proved that Miltiades did not forfeit at that time the favour of the Great King. But while it was easy at the trial of Miltiades to represent him as doing and saying certain things which he never did or said—of which perhaps he did and said the exact opposite—, it is almost impossible to conceive a completely new historical episode concocted by the Philaids for the occasion. It is hard to fancy that Miltiades and his friends invented out of their heads a trans-Danubian expedition in which Darius met a disaster, if there had been no fact to suggest the idea. That would have been a stroke of genius. It is one thing to alter old, and add new, facts in a given framework; it is another to invent the framework itself.

This general argument would perhaps seem hardly sufficient, alone; but it is confirmed by certain facts which render the conclusion irresistible. It is confirmed by the relations of Darius to the adventurer Histiaeus. It is certain that Darius felt an abiding gratitude to Histiaeus, for some service rendered to him in the European

[1] For the Tyras or Dniester it may be urged there is something to be said on evidence outside Herodotus altogether. The notice of Strabo of the Desert of the Getae between the Pruth and the Dniester, and of the Dniester as the limit of the Persian expedition, lends itself of course to reconstruction. But what was the source of Strabo (or Ephorus)? How do we know that it was any source independent of Herodotus? Mr. Macan justly observes that the record 'may be in part or in whole a product of reflection and criticism, rather than a survival of living memory and tradition' (p 47). Nor can we practically deal with the notice of Ctesias, or put any confidence in the fifteen days' march and the exchange of bows.

[2] And it is the conquest of Thrace without doubt that Darius means when he records an expedition overseas against the 'Scyths.' *Records of the Past*, 9, 68.

[3] This seems to be Mr. Macan's opinion. 'Duncker has done more than any other scholar to rescue the story of events beyond the Danube from total and indiscriminate condemnation. The items...yield an historical deposit' (*op. cit.* p. 47). But on the same page he speaks doubtfully: 'If Dareios crossed the Danube at all, if the passage of the river be anything more than an exaggerated replica of the passage of the Bosphorus,' &c. Duncker's line of argument is not altogether convincing.

expedition, above and beyond the general service of help and faith, for which he rewarded the Greek tyrants. This is a cardinal point in the adventurer's subsequent career. It might, however, be suspected that the Danube incident was invented to account for the favour shown to Histiaeus by the Great King. And if it be said that the use of the same incident for a different purpose by the Philaids points to the conclusion that the incident is historical, it might still be argued that the Philaid version in which the interest centres in Miltiades was simply borrowed with suitable modifications from the Milesian (presumably Milesian) version in which the interest centred in Histiaeus. But fortunately we are in a position to prove that the groundwork of the story is historical. In a context which has nothing to do with either Miltiades or Histiaeus, in a passage which has no connection with Scythian geography, and does not even occur in the same book as the Scythian Logi, Herodotus, incidentally and as a pure matter of business, explains the Persian reduction of Antandros and Lamponium, Lemnos and Imbros by the following words: *τοῦς μὲν λιποστρατίης ἐπὶ Σκύθας αἰτιεύμενος τοὺς δὲ σίνεσθαι τὸν Δαρείου στρατὸν τὸν ἀπὸ Σκυθέων ὀπίσω ἀποκομιζόμενον* (B. 5, c. 27 *ad fin.*). This precious notice supplies just the corroboration we require. We can regard as certain the three main facts: (1) that Darius crossed the Danube, leaving the fleet to bridge his return; (2) that his communications were cut; and (3) that there was a division of opinion among the Greek commanders whether they should leave him in the lurch, and, although the bridge was not broken down, some contingents were disloyal to him.

§ 6. Having established on these grounds the conclusion that Darius did engage in a trans-Danubian excursion of some sort, we have now to consider whether Herodotus reveals any facts bearing on the object, nature, or circumstances of this excursion. We have not to attempt to discriminate what is probable from what is improbable in a tale which as a whole is entirely fictitious. Such a method is false and the effort would be futile. But we have to seek whether there is, embedded in the story, anything which by its heterogeneity or incongruity betrays an origin distinct from its fabulous surroundings. If there is nothing of the kind, the key for the solution of the problem is hopelessly lost.

§ 7. Now there is one remarkable notice in the course of the fairytale, which stands apart from the rest—the notice of the forts which the Persians built on the Oaros. It stands apart from the rest of the narrative, because Herodotus vouches in a special way for its truth. He states that the remains of the eight forts were preserved to his own day.[1] This implies that he had information from some who professed to have knowledge of the existence of the Persian forts. I cannot agree to pass over as lightly as Mr. Macan the statement concerning the forts on the Oaros. Its significance is that for this point Herodotus had another source. That source may or may not have been some one who knew the Euxine regions; but in any case Herodotus was credibly (in his own opinion) informed that remains of the Persian forts were still to be seen. And we have to reckon with this, as evidence—presumptive evidence, that there were forts: possibly false evidence, but evidence which can be dealt with, and therefore may not be summarily set aside as either worthless or impracticable. Now it is strange that the one fact in the whole story which—whether true or false—is at least tangible and, by itself, intelligible, and which seems to stand on a different footing, should be placed in the most uncouth of all the uncouth regions which are described, beyond the bounds of Scythia itself, on the banks of an undiscoverable river. The tale, which says not a word of the city of Olbia, knows about buildings on the banks of a stream beyond the Don. It was hardly unnatural that the candour of Herodotus should be questioned.

§ 8. The accompanying geographical statement must be considered. Four great rivers flow into the Maeotic lake: Lycus, Oaros, Tanais, and Syrgis. It is only at this stage that Herodotus has discovered this startling piece of his knowledge. In his geographical descriptions of southern Russia he does not betray the slightest suspicion of it. In cc. 20, 21, and again in cc. 57, 58, we hear nothing of the four great rivers, we hear nothing of the Lycus and Oaros. In those passages Herodotus restricts himself to fact, and only the Don flows into the sea of Azov. In the second passage indeed he mentions the Hyrgis, which is clearly the same as the Syrgis, but it is a tributary of the Don, and can naturally be identified with the Donetz. It is strange that, when we are arrested, in the career of the wild tale, by ruined forts

[1] C. 124 *τῶν ἔτι ἐς ἐμὲ τὰ ἐρείπια σῶα ἦν.* These words do not suggest to me that Herodotus desired to leave the impression that he had seen them, without stating it. But they do imply that he had special reasons for believing the *ἐρείπια* to exist.

which stood in the days of Herodotus, we should have at the same moment to assist in the discharge of two unheard of rivers into the lake of Maeotis; for one could hardly think seriously of equating them with the Manytz and the Sal.

But this very incongruity furnishes us with the key. The forts were built; remains of their walls may well have existed in the days of Herodotus; but, needless to say, they were not built in the regions of the Don. *The tale has translated the forts from the regions of the Danube to the other end of Scythia, and translated the river along with them.* The Ὄαρος belongs to western, or as it might be called Dacian, rather than to eastern Scythia: to the same area as the Τέαρος and the Ἄραρος.[1] It was necessary to the artistic economy of the tale that the forts should mark the ultimate point which the Great King and his host reached; but they were indissolubly associated with the Ὄαρος; and therefore forts and river were transported through space together by a wave of the story-teller's wand.

§ 9. We have now reached two conclusions. The trans-Danubian operations of Darius were confined to regions west of the river Pruth (for, had he advanced eastward, the fleet would have accompanied him); and one of those operations was the construction of forts on a river. Before attempting to define the scene more strictly or to discover the object, I have a word to say on the description which Herodotus offers[2] of the river system of Roumania. Five rivers are enumerated as augmenting the waters of the Danube on the Scythian, that is, the left side. Their names are: (1) Πόρατα or Πυρετός (2) Τιάραντος (3) Ἄραρος (4) Νάπαρις (5) Ὀρδησσός. Mr. Macan has projected these rivers on the rectangular chart of Scythia which Herodotus sketches in cc. 99–101. On that chart the Danube forms the west side of the rectangle and consequently, in all its lower course, flows from north to south, until it takes an eastward bend at the mouth. It seems to me that, when he wrote this account of the rivers, the geographer had not this rectangular scheme in his head, but envisaged the course of the Danube (just as in c. 99, where he describes it as πρὸς εὖρον ἄνεμον τὸ στόμα τετραμμένος) in a manner which approached more nearly to its true direction. For it is hard to see what is meant by saying that the Porata (Pruth) flowed πρὸς ἠῶ and the Tiarantos πρὸς ἑσπέρης μᾶλλον, if the Ister's course was southward. Mr. Macan's map does not explain this. That Herodotus did not bind his imagination to one hard and fast scheme of Scythian geography, is shown abundantly by Mr. Macan's analysis. I therefore take it that in this context he conceived the Ister flowing rather from west to east than from north to south. Of the five tributaries the identity of the Porata with the Pruth is obvious. In regard to the Tiarantos, we are met by a difficulty. The name at once suggests the Sereth.[3] But though Herodotus mentions it second in order, he goes on to say that the other three rivers, Araros, Naparis and Ordessos, flow between it and the Pruth (διὰ μέσου τούτων ἰόντες). We should have in that case to give up the comparison of the Sereth with the Tiarantos, and seek for the latter river in the Argèche or some stream further west. But as it happens that the Ordessos craves for comparison with the Arjish, and as the Aluta can hardly be anything but the Μάρις which Herodotus mentions presently, the Tiarantos would have to be the Vede, and the Naparis or Araros would correspond to the Sereth. It seems more likely that the first order is right, and the explanation (διὰ μέσου τούτων ἰόντες) wrong. Taking the rivers in the first order we get: (1) Porata = Pruth, (2) Tiarantos = Sereth, (3) Araros = Buzeo, (4) Naparis = Jalomnitza, (5) Ordessos = Arjish. These identifications of Tiarantos, Naparis, and Ordessos are adopted on the map of Thrace and Scythia which Mr. Macan prefixes to his Appendix volume. If they are admitted, the equation of the Araros to the Buzeo logically follows.

Then Herodotus proceeds: οὗτοι μὲν αὐτιγενέες ποταμοὶ Σκυθικοὶ συμπληθύουσι αὐτὸν (Ister), ἐκ δὲ Ἀγαθύρσων Μάρις ποταμὸς ῥέων συμμίσγεται τῷ Ἴστρῳ. The Maris is not the Maros, which flows not into the Ister, but into the Theiss; a glance at the map shews that it is the Aluta (Olt). The Agathyrsi inhabited Siebenbürgen, and this river flows far through Siebenbürgen before it falls

[1] The name Lykos seems also out of place in the Maeotic region. This river, like the Hypakyris, Gerros, and Pantikapes, remains unexplained. To interpret the Oaros as the Volga is to enter a new region and new difficulties. I cannot see the slightest plausibility in going to Hunnic (*var*, fluentum) and Lesghian (*wor*, river) for the etymology of the name. With our present lights, Iordanes cannot safely be used for the illustration of Herodotus.

[2] C. 48.

[3] The earliest mention I remember of the name in its modern form is in the *De Adm. Imp.* of Constantine Porph., c. 38, p. 171, ed. Bonn, ὁ καλούμενος Σέρετος. In the same passage the Pruth is Βροῦτος.

down into Walachia and reaches the Danube.[1]

§ 10. It has been suggested by Thirlwall that in making an excursion beyond the Danube Darius only wanted to make a hostile demonstration, for the purpose of overawing the trans-Danubian Scythians and displaying to their amazement the power of the Great King. This theory is inadequate, for it does not explain the line of forts.

Another theory of the Scythian expedition is that it was an enterprise not of conquest, but of discovery. This view was maintained by Curtius. Now west of the Pruth there is only one exploring expedition that Darius could conceivably have undertaken, namely an Anaplûs of the Ister; just as east of the Pruth the only enterprise of such a kind that could have occurred to him as practicable and worth the trouble was a Periplûs of the Euxine. The Ister was one of the great rivers of the world, the Nile of the north, and one could imagine that the Persian monarch might have desired to trace its course or have had some thoughts of possibly discovering its source. Such an enterprise seems indeed one which Darius was the least likely of men to embark upon, but in any case this theory is inconsistent with our data. For there was no Anaplûs. The fleet was used to transport the host across the river, and then awaited its return. The fleet did not accompany the army, and therefore the army did not follow the Danube. The fact that the fleet remained in one place while the army was gone is fundamental. Moreover the theory of exploration would not explain the line of forts.

A third possible motive for the expedition of Darius would be that of conquest. It might be held that Darius desired to make the Transylvanian mountains the northern frontier of his European dominion. The people of Walachia were homogeneous with the people of Thrace; in race and in language they probably differed as little from the folk between the Danube and the Haemus, as the Greeks in one Thessalian valley differed from their neighbours in another. It could then be maintained that the line of forts was a complement of the mountain rampart, and connected with the frontier in Moldavia. But this theory also breaks down on the data. Apart from the objection that Darius would almost certainly have looked upon the Danube as the true northern frontier of his new provinces, it is sufficient to point out that the conquest of Walachia would certainly not have been attempted without the cooperation of the fleet; in other words, there would have been an Anaplûs, and the river would have been explored as far as the Iron Gate. But there was no Anaplûs.

§ 11. What then can the object of Darius have been? What can he have sought beyond the Danube? Not to conquer, not to explore, not to intimidate. But intimidation, discovery, and conquest seem to exhaust the possibilities. Besides ambition, military policy, and curiosity, what other motive can impel a ruler to undertake a dangerous excursion into the unknown? There is another motive which is not the weakest in the world. Darius wanted gold.

This is the only hypothesis which will explain the data. Darius aimed at gaining control of the goldmines of the land of the Agathyrsi—the goldmines of Siebenbürgen. Herodotus furnishes an important notice of the Agathyrsi. He states that, though in general their customs were similar to those of the Thracians, they had peculiarities of their own, and they were distinguished by their habit of wearing gold ornaments and their luxury. Ἀγάθυρσοι δὲ ἁβρότατοι ἀνδρῶν εἰσι καὶ χρυσοφόροι τὰ μάλιστα.[2] The Agathyrsi were already tapping the veins of gold, which in later ages brought wealth to the fisc of Roman Emperors. The plan of Darius is clear enough. Crossing the Danube near Galatz, he marches up the course of the river Buzeo, with the purpose of entering Siebenbürgen by the Bodza Pass. He will leave a garrison in the country to work the mines, and its communications with the Danube are to be maintained by a line of forts, whose construction was begun immediately, along the river Buzeo. A Persian mining settlement among the hills of the Agathyrsi was a bold idea; but, if the expedition had been skilfully carried out at first—as Alexander the Great would have carried it out,—the design was by no means impracticable. In strong stone forts, a foreign garrison might have maintained itself for years; and improved methods of mining, with more refined fashions of luxury, might have reconciled the luxurious Agathyrsi to the presence of the oriental in their midst. The later importance of the Transylvanian goldmines shows that the venture was worth making. Dacia, after the Roman

[1] Xénopol maintains this view, I believe rightly (*Hist. des Roumains de la Dacie Trajane*, i. p. 11); but in doing so, he makes a curious mistake. He says that *Strabo* (7, 3, 13) states that *Trajan* sent boats with provisions up the Maris.

[2] IV. c. 104.

conquest, became a sort of Eldorado; and the goldworks were doubtless one of the chief motives which made the Emperors loth to abandon it.[1]

§ 12. But the Persian enterprise was mismanaged. What happened we know not, except that the communications with the Danube were cut[2] and an opportunity was offered to the Greeks of leaving Darius in the lurch. Darius succeeded in reaching the Danube, whether with great or with small losses; but he had failed in the object of his raid. To seek to extract history from the fabulous story which has magnified a march to Transylvania into a march beyond the Don, seems, as I have already said, fruitless. But there is one detail which clearly corresponds to fact, whether it is an accident or a case of a real historical deposit. When the 'Scythians' succeeded in cutting the communications of Darius, it is quite certain that they would have been crafty enough, and sufficiently alive to the situation, to apprize the Greeks of the fact and urge them to desert the Persian. The incident therefore of Skopasis and the Scythians seeking to persuade the Ionians to leave Darius to his fate[3] is essentially historical.

According to this reconstruction, the forts were on the banks of the Buzeo, and therefore the Oaros, which Herodotus locates beside the sea of Azov, is the Buzeo. But an analysis of the description of the tributaries of the lower Danube made it possible that the Buzeo was there designated by the Araros. Hence it would turn out that the Oaros and Araros are identical. The supposition of such an identity, taken by itself, seems to have little either against it or for it. The double forms Hyrgis and Syrgis, Porata and Pyretos, are hardly comparisons to the point. Nor can I reject the *possibility* that the Araros may after all be the Sereth; from which it would probably follow that Naparis = Jalomnitza, Ordessos = Arjish, Tiarantos = Vede. In that case the smaller stream of the Buzeo would be left out of this enumeration. At all events, the Oaros was, if not the Araros itself, the next-door stream to it.

§ 13. Curtius, Niebuhr before him, and others, have referred to reports of gold in Scythia as among the commercial motives which may have instigated the expedition of Darius. The object of this paper is to show that gold was the sole motive; and not vague reports of gold, but knowledge of gold in a definite region. And the Scythian expedition turns out to be a premature attempt by a Persian king to do what it was reserved for a Roman emperor to accomplish six hundred years later. It was an essay at the conquest of Dacia.

J. B. Bury.

P.S.—I regret that I had not read the illuminating essay of Mr. J. L. Myres in the reconstruction of the maps used by Herodotus (*Geogr. Journ.* Dec. 1896), till this paper was in type. He has put the chartography of Herodotus in a new light; but his conclusions do not affect my thesis.

[1] Cp. Jung, *Die Römer und Romanen*, p. 44.

[2] Macan, *op. cit.* p. 48, 'It seems improbable that Dareios voluntarily cut his communications with the Danube':—rather, impossible, in the circumstances—'it seems probable that they were cut, and therefore cut by the Scythians.'

[3] C. 136 *sqq.* The name of the chieftain Skopasis should be claimed as Daco-Thracian. Σκόπας is Thracian (cf. *C.I.A.* 3, 2496). The Aga-thyrsi were a Dacian people, as the name shows, and Idan-thyrsus too is clearly Dacian (presumably Aga-thyrsian) not Iranian. Nor is even the third leader, Taxakis, necessarily of Iranian character (for the termination cp. Thracian Ῥωνάκης).

CATULUS OF PARMA.

I wish to introduce to the notice of scholars the name of a Latin writer, hitherto unknown, whom I have found mentioned in the margin of two early MSS. of John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*. One of these is No. 24 in the public library of Soissons. It is of the late twelfth or early thirteenth century; the name of a very early—possibly the original—possessor is erased from the inscription recording his ownership; it was at a later date bequeathed by one Laurent Surreau, a canon of Rouen, to the cathedral library of his native city of Sens; and in the seventeenth century it was bought for the monastery of Prémontré, where it doubtless remained till the Revolution. The other MS. is No. 60 in the library of the Faculty of Medicine at Montpellier. The earlier part of this is of the same character and about the same date as the Soissons

MS.: it belonged to the abbey of Pontigny. For the first two books of the *Policraticus* these two MSS. agree in very full marginal references to the sources of John's numerous stories and quotations. Among these, four passages are referred to *Catulus*—or, as it is sometimes spelt, *Catullus-Parmensis*. I will give the passages with references to Giles's edition and to the reprint in Migne's *Patrologia Latina* cxcix. The text will follow the best MSS.

(1) *Hunting*. *Pol.* i. 4. Giles iii. p. 24. Migne col. 393 D.

Eo denique tempore primum captiuantur Athenae, quo interdictae uenationis edictum censuerunt esse soluendum, et artem utriusque uenationis cum exercitio publice admittendam.

I can throw no light on this story. The expression *utriusque uenationis* refers to the chase of beasts and the chase of birds.

(2) *Gaming*. *Pol.* i. 5. G. iii. p. 33. M. col. 399 A.

Atthalus Asiaticus, si gentilium historiis creditur, hanc ludendi lasciuiam dicitur inuenisse, ab exercitio numerorum paululum deflexa materia. Cum enim antiquiores illud exercitium dumtaxat approbarent, quod ad inuestigationem ueri disciplinasque liberales proficeret, uel recte uiuendi instrueret usum, hic subtili quidem licet infructuosa inuentione, ueteris exercitii duritiam non temperauit sed emolliuit, multis adhuc in pristina manentibus grauitate. A manibus namque Graecorum abacus nondum excidit, aut ratio calculandi, aut ludus in quo plene uicisse est ad denuntiatum calculum in campis aduersarii constituisse perfectam et maximam armoniam. Cum uero in eisdem armonica, arismetica, uel geometrica trium terminorum medietate exultat, semiplena uictoria est. Quaeuis aliarum, etsi contingant citra triumphi gloriam, aut ludentis felicitatem aut artis peritiam protestantur. Iocundum quidem et fructuosum est numerorum nosse certamina, qui depraedationi inueniantur obnoxii, et qua ratione in castris sint alii tutiores, omnium periculorum ignari, nisi forte circumuenti ab hostibus captiuentur. Huius uoluptate certaminis Tholomeum (=Ptolomaeum), *Alexandrum, Cesarem, Catonem, ipsum quoque Samium grauiores operas legimus temperasse, quo inter ludendum id agerent, unde essent philosophicis negotiis aptiores. Alea uero, exciso regno Asiae, inter manubias euersae urbis non sub una tantum specie migrauit ad Graecos.*

I do not propose to discuss here the difficult passage about the game of numbers, especially as I do not think it is necessarily, or even probably, derived from Catulus. But what is certainly due to him, the ascription to Attalus of the invention of gaming, occurs, so far as I know, nowhere else. No other source than this passage of John is mentioned for the story in the treatises of Sanftlebius, Bulenger, and Souter on the games of the ancients, contained in Gronovius *Thes. Antiqu. Graec.* vii. Becq de Fouquières, who alludes to it (*Les Jeux des Anciens*, p. 304), gives no reference, but doubtless depends, directly or through the authors already mentioned, on John also. It has occurred to me that the phrase *gentilium historiis* may contain the title of Catulus' book. If so, he must have been a Christian writer.

(3) *Gaming*. *Pol.* i. 5. G. iii. p. 35. M. col. 400 B.

Chilon Lacedemonius iungendae societatis causa missus Corinthum duces et seniores populi ludentes inuenit in alea. Infecto itaque negotio reuersus est, dicens se nolle gloriam Spartanorum, quorum uirtus constructo Bissantio (=Byzantio) *clarescebat, hac maculare infamia, ut dicerentur cum aleatoribus contraxisse societatem.*

No one has yet traced this story beyond John: although it has attracted some attention, owing to its occurrence in Chaucer (*Pardoner's Tale* 603—620), who took it, together with the following story from Justin about Demetrius and the king of Parthia, from the *Policraticus*. By a slip of memory Chaucer writes for 'Chilon' 'Stilbon,' the name of the planet Mercury in Martianus Capella. For the association of this sort of games with Corinth cp. Euripides *Medea* 67 *sqq.*

(4) *Omens*. *Pol.* i. 13. G. iii. p. 57. M. col. 413 D.

Dum Gaius Cesar ciuili bello patriae immineret, quam fulminosus aer extiterit, quot habuerit igneos turbines, quot trabes emiserit, nec ueteres historiae sufficiunt enarrare.

CLEMENT C. J. WEBB.
MAGDALEN COLLEGE, OXFORD.
Apr. 2, 1897.

ON STYLOMETRY.

(*Abstract of a paper read at the Oxford Philological Society on May 21st. by* Dr. W. Lutoslawski, *of Drozdowo, near Lomza, Poland.*)

Mr. Lutoslawski, after a short survey of earlier investigations on Plato's style, explained his own method of measuring stylistical affinities, which he calls *stylometry.* Stylometry is a new science, which investigates samples of text as to their style, as palaeography investigates the external peculiarities of manuscripts. The difference between stylometry and the investigations made heretofore by German inquirers under the name of Sprachstatistik consists in the following points:

1. Only equal samples of text are comparable as to the number of peculiarities which they contain, while heretofore each dialogue has been taken as one whole without regard to its length. It has not been noticed that the pages of Stephanus or of Teubner are not a measure of text because they contain more or less words according to the extent of Latin translation in Stephanus, or to the number of questions and answers beginning a new line in Teubner's edition. The ideal measure of a sample of text is the number of words, and as long as this has not been ascertained the most equal pages are those of Didot's edition.

2. Great numbers of stylistical peculiarities are required for correct inferences. C. Ritter investigated only forty peculiarities of style, and many other inquirers have drawn inferences from a single occurrence of a single peculiarity. The chronological conclusions drawn by W. Lutoslawski in his work *On the origin and growth of Plato's logic* (to be published in Octob. '97 by Longmans) are based on the comparison of five hundred peculiarities representing fifty eight thousand observations made by various investigators.

3. The different importance of stylistical peculiarities ought to be accounted for, and this has not been done heretofore. A classification of peculiarities into four degrees of accidental, repeated, important and very important peculiarities leads us to a more exact determination of stylistical affinities. An accidental peculiarity is a word or locution occurring once in a dialogue. If this is common to two dialogues, it forms the slightest link of stylistical affinity, the unit of measurement. A repeated peculiarity common to two dialogues, or to a dialogue with a group of dialogues, corresponds to two units. A frequent peculiarity is equivalent to three units, a very frequent to four units. Thus each dialogue has a certain number of units of affinity with any other dialogue, with any group of dialogues, and this affords a measure of the greater or smaller similarity of style.

4. Accidental peculiarities have never been considered in the study of Plato's style except by Lewis Campbell in his Introduction to the *Sophist* and *Politicus* (1867). This class being the most numerous, it is very valuable, if only great numbers are taken into account. It is accidental that a word is common to the *Sophist* and *Laws*, but it is not accidental that the *Sophist* has twice as many words or other peculiarities in common with the *Laws* as it has with the *Phaedo* or *Symposium.*

In order to find a sufficient number of stylistical peculiarities for chronological inferences, W. Lutoslawski had recourse to many German dissertations written for the purpose of a study of Greek grammar, and containing full enumerations of all passages of Plato for each special use of a preposition or some particle. These authors had no other aim in their inquiry than to ascertain that Plato's use of a particular word did not essentially differ from the use of other Attic authors; but their enumerations afford useful indications for a knowledge of Plato's style. From such publications we might gather a list of several thousand stylistical peculiarities. In his first attempt at a systematic study of Plato's style, W. Lutoslawski limited the choice to 500 peculiarities, and to twenty-two of the most important dialogues. He proposed as the highest hypothesis on which all inferences from style are based the following *law of stylistical affinity:*

Of two samples of text of the same author and of the same size, that is nearer in time to a third which shares with it the greater number of units of affinity (each peculiarity being evaluated according to its importance as equivalent to a certain number of units, and provided the number of observed peculiarities is sufficient to determine the stylistical character of each sample of text). For the correct interpretation of this general psychological law the following rules are proposed:

1. A sufficient number to determine the stylistical character of a sample of text must be greater than has been used heretofore. For samples of text not inferior to twenty pages ed. Didot five hundred peculiarities have been found sufficient.

2. The minimal difference in the number of units of affinity indispensable for chronological inferences is now estimated to be a difference of 10 °/₀ between two works, even this being in some cases insufficient.

3. The standard of comparison for the latest group are the *Laws*, and for other works the latest group of six dialogues: *Sophist, Politicus, Philebus, Timaeus, Critias, Laws.*

In order to test the law of stylistical affinity and the above rules, such samples of text have been compared about the order of which we have Plato's own indications. Thus he refers in some books of the *Republic* to earlier books of the same dialogue; in the *Timaeus* to the *Republic*; in the *Critias* to the *Timaeus;* in the *Sophist* to the *Theaetetus;* in the *Politicus* to the *Sophist*, and less evidently in the *Phaedo* to the *Meno*, in the *Philebus* to the *Parmenides*. This affords a number of tests. For instance we find out of 500 peculiarities of later style in Bk. 1. of the *Republic* 28 accidental, 6 repeated, 3 important peculiarities, equivalent together to 49 units. In Bk. X 35 accidental, 14 repeated, 15 important, 6 very important peculiarities, equivalent to 132 units. This relation might be expressed in the following formula:

Rep. I. (20½ pp. Did.): $28^{I}\ 6^{II}\ 3^{III}$ (=49) → *Rep.* X. (19½ pp. Did.): $35^{I}\ 14^{II}\ 15^{III}\ 6^{IV}$ (=132).

Other relations discovered by the same method may be expressed as follows:—

Rep. 357a–412a (37½ pp. Did.): $47^{I}\ 20^{II}\ 22^{III}\ 2^{IV}$ (=161) → *Rep.* 412b–471c (39 pp.): $45^{I}\ 23^{II}\ 31^{III}\ 2^{IV}$ (=192).

Rep. 368a–445e (53 pp.): $47^{I}\ 30^{II}\ 32^{III}\ 2^{IV}$ (=211) → *Rep.* VIII.–X. (53½ pp.): $54^{I}\ 36^{II}\ 29^{III}\ 5^{IV}$ (=233).

→ *Timaeus* (53 pp. ed. Did.): $123^{I}\ 58^{II}\ 44^{III}\ 14^{IV}$ (=427).

Rep. X. (19½ pp.): $35^{I}\ 14^{II}\ 15^{III}\ 6^{IV}$ (=132) → *Critias* (11 pp.) $51^{I}\ 8^{II}\ 18^{III}\ 12^{IV}$ (=169).

Gorg. + *Rep.* (256 pp.) $76^{I}\ 124^{II}\ 30^{III}\ 4^{IV}$ (=430) → *Laws* (238 pp.): $175^{I}\ 176^{II}\ 37^{III}\ 20^{IV}$ (=718).

Theaetet. (53 pp.): $58^{I}\ 41^{II}\ 31^{III}$ (=233).

→ *Sophist* (40 pp.): $139^{I}\ 36^{II}\ 59^{III}\ 20^{IV}$ (=468).

→ *Politicus* (43 pp.): $163^{I}\ 43^{II}\ 56^{III}\ 19^{IV}$ (=493).

More tests of the same kind have been used and the law of stylistical affinity, when thus verified, has been found always confirmed. Wherever we have Plato's own testimony that a sample of his text is later than another, the later sample has been found to contain a greater number of units of affinity with the *Laws* and the five dialogues which in style are nearest to the *Laws*.

This method led to the calculation of a table of affinities, expressing the relative value of the stylistical affinity of each dialogue with the latest group. The details will be found in the third chapter of the *Origin and Growth of Plato's Logic*, (Longmans, 1897). The new method of stylometry led to the following results as to the order of Platonic dialogues:

1. *Gorgias* is later than *Meno, Euthydemus, Protagoras* and all Socratic dialogues.

2. *Cratylus, Symposium, Phaedo* form a group later than the *Gorgias* and were written probably in the order here mentioned.

3. *Republic* Bks. II.–X. have been written in a few years, and are later than the *Phaedo*. The composition of this work has not been interrupted by other labours; only Bk. I. is very much earlier, probably written between *Gorgias* and *Cratylus*.

4. *Phaedrus* is written about 379 B.C. and after the *Republic*. The concluding passage, in which educational activity is esteemed above literary activity, is explained by the circumstance that Plato dedicated himself after the *Phaedrus* solely to his oral teaching, and interrupted his literary activity for about twelve years.

5. *Theaetetus* and *Parmenides* follow after a long interval, probably after 368 B.C.

6. *Sophist* and *Politicus* are later than *Parmenides; Philebus* is later than the *Sophist*, and perhaps later than the *Politicus*.

7. *Timaeus* and *Critias* are later than the *Sophist*, and probably later than *Politicus* and *Philebus*.

8. The *Laws* are later than the *Sophist*, probably later than *Politicus* and *Philebus* and written contemporaneously with the *Timaeus* and *Critias*.

These results have an objective value, because they are based on the broad basis of fifty-eight thousand observations on Plato's style. The remaining difficulties can easily find their solution by the same method, which also might be successfully applied to the chronology of other authors, especially Shakespeare. Stylometry is henceforth a new and powerful instrument of historical

research and deserves the special attention of all philologers and historians. The lecturer invites all intending investigators on this new field to communicate with him (74 S. Andres, La Coruña, Spain) and to avail themselves of his experience. He thanks the Oxford Philological Society for the attention paid to his first attempt to lecture in English, which happens also to be the first public explanation of the method of stylometry, and the first opportunity for a Pole to express his views to this distinguished Society.

OVID'S *HEROIDES*.

(*continued from p.* 242)

XII 62–66.

Mane erat, et thalamo cara recepta soror
disiectamque comas aduersaque in ora iacentem
inuenit et lacrimis omnia plena meis.
orat opem Minyis: alter petit, alter habebit:
Aesonio iuueni, quod rogat illa, damus.

In 65 G and the old editors have *petit altera et altera habebit* which is un-Ovidian in metre and makes nothing fit to be called sense ('my sister asks and my sister shall have'). It is altered by some to *at altera habebat* ('my sister asks the boon but it was mine to give'), by others to *at alter habebit* ('but another, i.e. Iason, will have it'): these changes mend nothing but the metre.

All this while the reading of P is *alter petit alter habebit*. This was commended long ago by Salmasius at Iul. Capit. Maximin. 1 'barbaro etiam patre et matre genitus, quorum *alter* e Gothis, *alter* ex Alanis genitus esse perhibetur', and more lately by Mr Birt in the Goettingische gelehrte Anzeigen for 1882 p. 854 who says 'bei der sentenziösen Form der Rede musste hier für *altera petit* nothwendig *alter petit* eintreten'; and it is printed by the three last editors Messrs Sedlmayer Ehwald and Palmer. The grammar is no doubt correct enough, but the sense is every whit as foolish as before. When you have said that A asks help for B you never add that the asker is one person and the recipient will be another: that is said already, and more than that. Reverse the order, say 'alter petit, alter habebit: soror orat opem Minyis', and you will get something like sense: then you will be saying first that one person makes a request for another, and you will be saying secondly who those two persons are. But the verse as it stands is in the full sense of the term preposterous.

Ovid wrote

orat opem Minyis. alter petit, <impetrat> alter:
Aesonio iuueni, quod rogat illa, damus.

'My sister asks my aid for the Minyae. The boon is begged by one but extorted by another: it is to Iason that I yield the request preferred by Chalciope'. What moved Medea was not her sister's prayers but her own passion for Iason: this is stated first in the vaguest terms, then explained with particularity in the pentameter. The scribe glanced from *petit* to *-petrat* and left the verse defective, so *habebit* was tacked on at the end. A parallel will be found in line 84 of this epistle: Ovid wrote 'sed mihi tam faciles *unde meosque deos?*' which stands in P; but G and other MSS have this wealth of variants, *arbitrer unde deos, unde putabo deos, unde deosque putem, unde deos habeam, esse putabo deos, auguror esse deos:* all springing from an archetypal 'sed mihi tam faciles *unde deos*' with *meosque* missing.

XII 89–92.

Haec animum—et quota pars haec sunt?—mouere puellae
simplicis, et dextrae dextera iuncta meae.
uidi etiam lacrimas: an pars est fraudis in illis?
sic cito sum uerbis capta puella tuis.

It is no use to quote ii 51 'credidimus

lacrimis : an et hae simulare docentur?' 'I trusted your tears : are tears also taught to feign?' where the interrogation and the present tense are as appropriate as they are inappropriate here. Here 'pars fraudis' means 'a share in your cajolery of me', and 'illis' therefore means '*your* tears': but it is absurd for Medea to ask whether Iason's tears helped to cajole her: she knows that they did, and she must here be affirming that they did. *an* is therefore altered to *a* by Mr Lucian Mueller, whom Mr Ehwald follows, and to *ac* by Mr Riese. But still we are not out of the wood : *est* should be *fuit :* the tears and the cajolery are both of them past and gone. This second error, though not the former, is abolished by Heinsius' proposal 'an pars *sua* fraudis' : he compares met. xiii 349 sq. 'desine Tydiden uultuque et murmure nobis | ostentare meum : *pars est sua laudis in illo*'. If you like to combine this conjecture with one of the others and write, say, '*a*, pars *sua* fraudis in illis', the verse will yield a proper meaning.

But the following is as near to the MSS, nearer to the parallel in met. xiii, and more pointed in sense :

uidi etiam lacrimas: pars est *sua laudis*
in illis,
si cito sum uerbis capta puella tuis.

si is Bentley's and should in any case be accepted. With *laudis* instead of *fraudis* the tense of *est* becomes correct : the glory still endures. Compare ii 65 sq. '*sum decepta tuis* et amans et *femina uerbis :* | di faciant *laudis* summa sit ista tuae' and x 130 'non ego sum *titulis* subripienda tuis'. I suppose that *ua* fell out before *la* and left *slaudis*, which was corrupted to *fraudis* by the simultaneous confusion of *s* with *f* and of *l* with *r*, just as, for instance, *fulgebat* was corrupted to *surgebat* at fast. ii 500 : then *an* is possibly the missing *ua* but more probably a metrical supplement. The conjectures '*a*, pars est *laudis* in illis' and '*a*, pars *et* fraudis in illis' I should think less likely.

XIV 53–66.

Saeuus, Hypermestra, pater est tibi :
iussa parentis
effice : germanis sit comes iste suis.—
femina sum et uirgo, natura mitis et
annis :
non faciunt molles ad fera tela
manus.—
quin age dumque iacet fortis imitare
sorores :
credibile est caesos omnibus esse
uiros.—
si manus haec aliquam posset commit-
tere caedem
morte foret dominae sanguinulenta
suae.—
hanc meruere necem patruelia regna
tenendo
* * * * * *
finge uiros meruisse mori : quid fecimus
ipsae?
quo mihi commisso non licet esse
piae?
quid mihi cum ferro? quo bellica tela
puellae?
aptior est digitis lana colusque meis.

This is Hypermestra's soliloquy on her marriage night, as repeated by herself. She argues alternately for and against the murder of her bridegroom : 53 sq. *for*, 55 sq. *against*, 57 sq. *for*, 59 sq. *against*, 61 sq....., 63 sqq. *against :* it is pretty clear, both from the contents (patruelia regna tenendo) and from the place of that distich in the series, that 61 sq. must be *for*. Therefore I have adopted the *hanc* of V and some other MSS : P reads *aut*, G apparently *i*, without meaning ; other MSS *haud* or *an* or *non* or *quid*, perverting the sense ; Mr Riese proposes *at* which may be right.

The pentameter which I leave blank is erased in P, and the second hand, which is good for nothing else, informs us what the erased words were not, by presenting in a mutilated form the ridiculous and unmetrical verse which we call 62 and which appears in most MSS as *quae tamen externis danda forent generis*. G also has this verse, but between 61 and 62 it exhibits the verse which we call 114, *cum sene nos inopi turba uagamur inops*. V, which in this place omits the four lines between 60 and 65, presents them after 118, and what it there presents is 61, 114, 63, 64, and not 62 at all.

Now come to the neighbourhood of 114 :

bella pater patruusque gerunt; regnoque
domoque 111
pellimur ; eiectos ultimus orbis habet. 112
ille ferox solio solus sceptroque potitur : 113
cum sene nos inopi turba uagamur
inops. 114
de fratrum populo pars exiguissima
restas : 115
quique dati leto, quaeque dedere, fleo. 116

The couplet 113–114 is not in P and is not in V: the pentameter is tautological after 111 sq., and the hexameter is stamped as non-Ovidian by the scansion *potītur*.

Now can anyone doubt what lies under the erasure in P between 61 and 63? The verse 114. P ignored 62 and ignored 113, just as V ignores them; and it placed 114 where V places it, after 61. In the source from which most of the other MSS descend, 114 was wrongly placed between 112 and 115, just fifty lines or two pages away, and then the hexameter 113 was fabricated to make it at home in its wrong place, and the pentameter 62 to fill up its right one; and both the fabrications bewray themselves by their metrical vices. In the source of G, though 114 still stood in its right place, 62 was imported from the other family and set beside it, and 114 was repeated in its wrong place with 113 by a similar importation. The original reading of P, 114 after 61, and 62 and 113 nowhere, is exactly preserved (without V's misplacement of 61–64 after 118) by the Gothanus primus, saec. xiii, which I mentioned in my note on vii 23 sqq. as giving the right lines in the right order at xiii 73 sqq.

Now I am not the first to perceive that 114 stood in P between 61 and 63: that has already been recognised by Mr Lucian Mueller d. r. m.[2] p. 27 and Mr Sedlmayer prolegg. p. 54. But they both think that P was here in error, and I believe I am the first to say what when once said is obvious, that between 61 and 63 is the right place for 114. The sense is perfect. Hypermestra nerves herself to strike with the reflexion

hanc meruere necem patruelia regna tenendo;
cum sene nos inopi turba uagamur inops.—

'They have earned this doom by usurping our kingdom; we are exiled and beggared'. Then she renders answer to herself 'Grant that they have deserved to die: have we deserved to be murderesses?'

XIV 79–82.

Mane erat, et Danaus generos ex caede iacentis
dinumerat. summae criminis unus abes.
fert male cognatae iacturam mortis in uno
et queritur facti sanguinis esse parum.

82. '*facti* sanguinis' is doubtless defensible: Livy xxxv 51 3 'nondum aut indicto bello aut ita commisso ut strictos gladios aut *sanguinem* usquam *factum* audissent': the *fusi* of G is therefore neither necessary nor even desirable, far less the *factum* of other MSS. But I confess that after '*cognatae* iacturam mortis' I expect something weightier than merely '*facti* sanguinis parum'; and I conjecture *sacri*. That means blood whose shedding is an abomination: Sen. Phoen. 277 sq. of the sceptre of the house of Laius 'nemo sine *sacro* feret | illud *cruore*', Thy. 94 sq. 'ne *sacra* manus | uiolate *caede*', Hor. epod. 7 19 sq. 'Remi | *sacer* nepotibus *cruor*', Lucan iii 314 sq. 'tractentur *uolnera* nulla | *sacra* manu', x 334 'mens inbuta semel *sacra* iam *caede*': iii 124 sq. 'nullasque feres, nisi *sanguine sacro* | sparsas, raptor, opes' is not quite parallel. The change is very easy, so like is *s* to *f* and *r* to *t*; and at fast. v 670 the two best MSS have *facta* for *sacra*.

XIV 101–108.

Per mare, per terras cognataque flumina curris:
dat mare, dant amnes, dat tibi terra uiam.
quae tibi causa fugae? quid, Io, freta longa pererras?
non poteris uultus effugere ipsa tuos.
Inachi, quo properas? eadem sequerisque fugisque:
tu tibi dux comiti, tu comes ipsa duci.
per septem Nilus portas emissus in aequor
exuit insana paelicis ora boue.

At 103 Egnatius long ago enquired whether *Io* here has its first syllable short 'as in the Ibis' or whether it is the interjection *io*. *Io* with its first syllable short is a false quantity: at Ibis 622 *Io* is not Ἰώ but Ἴων 'the Ionian'. *io* the interjection is metrical; but anything more exquisitely absurd than that impassioned exclamation in this purely formal apostrophe to a long-departed ancestress I cannot well imagine. Here then is one difficulty recognised: there remain three which seem to receive no attention at all. Has anyone ever asked himself what 'freta longa pererras' means? It describes very well the wanderings of Ulysses, but we are talking about Io: in what human tongue does 'freta longa pererrare' signify to swim the Bosporus? Again: Io is trying to

escape by flight from her own changed form, which clings to her still: am I the only person in the world who finds it comical that one in this situation should be described as 'sibi *dux*'? And again: does nobody else perceive that the hexameter 105 cannot coexist with 103, but must stand at the beginning of the apostrophe or stand nowhere at all?

The two verses 103 and 106 are interpolations prompted by the fact that 104 and 105 have by mischance been placed in inverted order, the pentameter before the hexameter. I have already pointed out a similar interpolation at 62 and 113; and at ix 82 Merkel detected another: 81 and 83 are interpolations prompted by the corruption of 82 from an hexameter into a pentameter. Our passage originally ran thus:

per mare, per terras cognataque flumina curris: 101
dat mare, dant amnes, dat tibi terra uiam. 102
Inachi, quo properas? eadem sequeris-que fugisque: 105
non poteris uultus effugere ipsa tuos. 104
per septem Nilus cet. 107

For the contrast of *fugis* and *effugere* compare Lucr. iii 1068 sq. 'hoc se quisque modo *fugit*...quem...*effugere* haud potis est.'

XV 39–44.

Si nisi quae facie poterit te digna uideri
nulla futura tua est, nulla futura tua est. 40
at, mea cum legeres, etiam formosa uidebar;
unam iurabas usque decere loqui.
cantabam, memini (meminerunt omnia amantes):
oscula cantanti tu mihi rapta dabas.

41. The vice in this line was first detected by Wakker. Reading Sappho's poems could not alter Phaon's opinion about Sappho's looks. What altered that opinion was to see and hear Sappho herself reading her poems aloud: this is plain from the pentameter and from the next distich. Wakker therefore corrected *legeres* to *legerem* and so restored the sense but ruined the metre. There is no such verse in Ovid; the two examples in Propertius are very soon emended; the one example in Tibullus is hard to emend, but his MSS are almost the worst in the world; Manil. i 794 sq. 'censu Tullius oris | emeritus caelum et Claudi *magna* propago' is to be corrected *haud indigna* or *nec* Claudi *indigna*; iv 661 'obruit, et Libyam *Italas* infudit in urbes' has already been corrected *Latias*. Here one MS has *tibi iam* for *etiam*, and this Mr de Vries proposes to accept. But write

at, mea cum *legerem*, *sat iam* formosa uidebar.

legerēsatiam for *legeresetiam*. Of the form *sat* I spoke at vii 85: the present passage is imitated from Prop. ii 18 29 sq. 'mihi per te poteris *formosa uideri*: | mi *formosa sat es*, si modo saepe uenis'.

XV 139, 140.

Illuc mentis inops, ut quam furialis Enyo
abstulit, in collo crine iacente feror.

Enyo is given by the best MS: the variants *Eritho* and *Erictho* and *Erinnis* and the like are merely corruptions of this *Enyo* or *Enuo*: see Mart. spect. 24 3 *Ethiuo*, *Ethriuo*, vi 32 1 *Eripo*, Petron. 120, 62 *Erinis*, Lucan i 687 *Erynis*, Sil. x 202 *Erinis*, all blunders for the same name. Here the editors read *Erichtho* and suppose it to be the name of a witch because there is a witch of that name in the sixth book of Lucan. Mr de Vries has an excursus on the passage and is inclined to accept *Enyo*; but since it cannot here mean the goddess of war he diffidently proposes to take it as equivalent to *Erinys*. Mr Palmer reads *Enyo*, in what sense I do not know.

It means Bellona: not of course the Italian goddess of war, but the Cappadocian goddess of hysterics whom the Romans brought home from the Mithradatic campaigns and the frenzy of whose votaries is described at length in Tibull. i 6 45 and more briefly in dozens of other places. Ovid requires a Greek name for Sappho to call her by, and takes the Ἐννώ which was the recognised equivalent of the other Bellona. The question whether Sappho had ever heard of this divinity was not likely to trouble either him or his readers, who had been accustomed from their childhood to see the Bellonarii misconducting themselves in the streets of Rome.

XV 197, 198.

Non mihi respondent ueteres in carmina uires,
plectra dolore tacent, muta dolore lyra est.

Ovid never wrote such a pentameter as this; and if you say that the writer of this epistle was not Ovid, he never wrote such a pentameter either. Verse 40 cited above is a piece of false taste, but its perpetrator had his eyes open and gloried in his deed: this is a piece of sheer incompetence. Read and punctuate as follows:

plectra dolore *iacent* muta, dolore *lyra*.

est is omitted by one MS: it was not unnaturally added by scribes who did not see the construction. I think it less likely that the poet wrote *lyrae* and the scribes took it for *lyra ē*. *iacent* is in the ed. Ven. 1558: the change is nothing and the improvement is something, so I adopt it. But '*tacent* muta' is defensible: see Petron. 126 'fabula muta taces', Ovid met. iv 433, vii 184, Tibull. iv 1 129 'muta silentia', Prop. iv 3 53 'omnia surda tacent'.

XV 201, 202.

Lesbides, infamem quae me fecistis amatae,
desinite ad citharas turba uenire meas.

This is not Latin, any more than Prop. i 19 13 'illic formosae ueniant chorus heroinae': *turba* cannot be thus employed without an epithet. Bentley knew this right well, and accordingly conjectured 'ad *citharae uerba* uenire *meae*'. But all that wants doing is to strike away one letter:

desinite ad citharas turba uenire *mea*.

For the arrangement of words in the verse compare, if it is worth while, x 46 'postquam desierant uela uidere tua'. The phrase *turba mea* or *tua* or *sua* is frequent: am. i 1 6 'Pieridum uates, non *tua turba* sumus', ars iii 811 sq. '*mea turba*, puellae | inscribant spoliis, Naso magister erat', trist. i 5 34 'cetera Fortunae, non *mea turba* fuit', Prop. iii 3 31 'Veneris dominae uolucres, *mea turba*, columbae', Aetna 580 'sacer in bellum numerus, *sua turba* regenti', Sil. xi 395 'uerum agite, o *mea turba*, precor', Stat. silu. i 1 95 sq. '*tua turba* relicto | labetur caelo', i 2 69 sq. 'duro nec enim ex adamante creati | sed *tua turba* sumus', Theb. x 297 '*sua* quemque cruento | limite *turba* subit'. In her. x 126 'cum steteris *turbae* celsus in ore *tuae*' the text is not quite certain. I have not quoted fast. iii 251, where *mea turba* is only a blundering conjecture of Merkel's; but I will quote, for it is almost as apposite, the true reading of that passage, which was discovered long ago by Heinsius and which no modern editor but Mr G. A. Davies has had the wit to adopt, 'mater amat nuptas: *matris* me *turba* frequentat'.

A. E. Housman.

(*To be continued.*)

THE SPEECH OF ATHENE-MENTES *α* 253 *seq.*

After expressing a wish that Odysseus might return in the full strength of his manhood to take vengeance on the suitors, Mentes says that this rests with the gods, and goes on to exhort Telemachus to consider (not how he may take vengeance, but) how he may clear the house of them, ἀπώσεαι ἐκ μεγάροιο, v. 270. To this end three measures are proposed, (1) before the assembly of the Achaeans solemnly to order the suitors to leave (the object of this is, as it were, to out-law them; cf. Andrew Lang, *Homer and the Epic*, p. 263), (2) to bid his mother return to her father's house, if she is bent on marriage, and (3) to go to the mainland after news of his father: if he hears that there is reason still to hope for the return of Odysseus, then he is to (take no further step, but) possess his soul in patience for a year; but if he hears that Odysseus is dead, then he is to pay the honours due to the dead, give his mother in marriage, and, after all this, proceed to consider with all earnestness, how he may kill the suitors in his house. To hearten him for so great an emprise, Mentes reminds him of the great deed of Orestes, the punishment of Aegisthus (the recollection of which by Zeus starts the action of the *Odyssey*). The general drift of this speech is clear, and suits both the purpose of Athene's visit and her assumed character of

Mentes. But there are two notorious difficulties, (1) the meaning and construction of vv. 277–8, and (2) the direction to give his mother in marriage, and after that (v. 293), when one might expect there would be no longer any suitors, to consider the means of destroying these.

To deal first with the second difficulty. Ameis-Hentze truncate the speech at v. 292: 'probably 293–302' (the exhortation to kill the suitors and imitate Orestes) 'are not original.' On this theory Mentes does nothing, beyond advising the journey, to prepare Telemachus for the high task presently to be laid upon him, viz. of helping his father in the *μνηστηροφονια*; and the lines 374–380, which contain the threat of vengeance, if the suitors disregard the solemn warning that is to be addressed the next day to them, being likewise excised, Telemachus is supposed simply to give notice of the meeting of the Assembly (*α* 372–3) without mentioning its object, so that one is left wondering why Antinous replies, 'the gods themselves teach thee.'

α 385
ὑψαγόρην τ' ἔμεναι καὶ θαρσαλέως ἀγορεύειν.

It is asserted that this threat is in *β* (141–145) an expression of vehement passion roused by the refusal of the suitors to withdraw, but that in *α* it is inconsistent with the character of Telemachus and the advice given by Athene-Mentes in the speech we are considering. But, (1) as a recent editor of *α*, C. O. Zuretti, remarks on v. 295, Mentes says nothing to imply that in his opinion only Odysseus is capable of attacking the suitors; and (2) Ameis-Hentze by the excision of *α* 293–302, 374–380 rob the book of its chief *motif*, the awakening of Telemachus by Athene to the full sense of manhood:

α 296
οὐδέ τί σε χρὴ
νηπιάας ὀχέειν, ἐπεὶ οὐκέτι τηλίκος ἐσσί·
. . . . . .
καὶ σύ, φίλος, μάλα γάρ σ' ὁρόω καλόν τε μέγαν τε,
ἄλκιμος ἔσσ' κ.τ.λ.

The goddess finds him a youth *ἐν γυναιξὶ τεθραμμένον* (Schol. on *α* 94) put to bed every night by his nurse, and one who bemoans helplessly what he cannot end. She leaves him a man ready to do and dare, who claims from all, his mother and her suitors alike, recognition of his rights as lord and master in his own house, and on the morrow takes his father's seat in the Assembly.

To the excision of *α* 293 *seq.* proposed by Ameis-Hentze we must prefer the explanation given briefly by Zuretti on *α* 293: 'the superior strength of the suitors was such, that, even if Penelope married, Telemachus could not eject them from his house; his only remedy, if he wished to enter into his inheritance, was to kill them.' It is true that after the marriage there would be no more 'suitors'; but is it really inconceivable, 'unbegreiflich,' that these men should still continue their life of riotous feasting at the expense of Telemachus? that they should not cease to abuse the rights of guests because their worthless pretext, the wooing of Penelope, was no longer available? and, if they should persist, must not Telemachus consider, how, his father being *ex hypothesi* dead, he should himself expel them? True, the condition, 'if they still frequent the house,' is not expressed: but it is also to be understood earlier in the speech where Telemachus is advised to go to the mainland, for, if the solemn warning advised in vv. 272–4 had the desired effect, then there could be no need for the journey: cf. Lang *ll.* 264.

Further, given the possibility of these men continuing their plunder of Telemachus after the marriage of his mother, one can point to a simple reason for the marriage preceding the slaughter of the suitors, a reason as simple as the solution of Wilamowitz' famous *ἀπορία*, that Telemachus ought not to sit down *α* 437 before he takes off his shirt. One takes off one's boots before one's shirt, just as reversely (cf. *β* 4) one puts on one's shirt before one's boots, and one cannot easily take off one's boots while one stands up. So here; if the suitors should be all killed before the marriage, no one would be left for Penelope to marry. But this she must do, if Odysseus is really dead; the situation in Ithaca is otherwise unintelligible. As Telemachus says, she loathes marriage, but does not decline it: *α* 249 *οὔτ' ἀρνεῖται στυγερὸν γάμον*, cf. *τ* 157. Perhaps the death of the husband revived in some measure the rights of the wife's father, who for the sake of the *ἕδνα* would force her to marry again: cf. *ο* 16 and *τ* 158. Or again an early custom may be reflected in the Athenian law inserted into Dem. *c. Macart.* p. 1076, § 75, from which it seems that widows remained in the husband's family only if pregnant. Telemachus' scruples about dismissing

Penelope depend on his uncertainty about his father's fate (*β* 131; cf., perhaps, *β* 134): he announces unconditionally that he will give his mother to a husband (*β* 223), if he can definitely ascertain his father's death.

I pass now to what is the real *crux* of the speech.

α 275–278
μητέρα δ', εἴ οἱ θυμὸς ἐφορμᾶται γαμέεσθαι,
ἂψ ἴτω ἐς μέγαρον πατρὸς μέγα δυναμένοιο·
οἱ δὲ γάμον τεύξουσι καὶ ἀρτυνέουσιν ἔεδνα
πολλὰ μάλ', ὅσσα ἔοικε φίλης ἐπὶ παιδὸς ἕπεσθαι.

Compare the words of Eurymachus:

β 195–7
μητέρ' ἐὴν ἐς πατρὸς ἀνωγέτω ἀπονέεσθαι·
οἱ δὲ γάμον κ.τ.λ.
πολλὰ μάλ' κ.τ.λ.

External evidence against the difficult line *πολλὰ μάλ, κ.τ.λ. α* 278 = *β* 197 is only to be got by transferring to *α* 278 the note of the scholiasts on

α 279
σοὶ δ' αὐτῷ πυκινῶς ὑποθήσομαι, αἴ κε πίθηαι·

that 'this line was not in the edition of Rhianus.' It can be omitted without injury to the syntax (though not without injury to the passage) as it forms a complete sentence. Such lines are omitted in good MSS. Thus G omits *β* 393, *γ* 396, F omits *ε* 351, P omits *θ* 106: cf. Molhuysen, *De tribus Odysseae codd.* p. 12. Accordingly the simplest course is to accept the scholion as it stands, and to suppose that Rhianus followed some MS. which happened to omit the line. The next best course is to suppose that he omitted vv. 279–292, either by an oversight on his own part, or because they were not in some of his MSS. The omission, of which, among our MSS., F is guilty, would have been due to the similar beginnings of vv. 278 and 292. Whatever the case may be, the external evidence against the line is naught in *β*, and very shadowy in *α*.

But can we dispense with v. 278? It seems rather, that the words *πολλὰ μάλ'* are indispensable, if one may (as, I think, one should) consider that the *ἔδνα* were mentioned as an inducement for Penelope to go to her father. As things were, the suitors were ready to give *ἔδνα*; see *λ* 117, *ν* 378, *τ* 529 (*ἀπερείσια*), and cf. *ο* 18. But if Penelope went back to the home *πατρὸς μέγα δυναμένοιο*, and the suitors also went to Icarius,

β 53
ὥς κ' αὐτὸς ἐεδνώσαιτο θύγατρα,

then Icarius would have more to do with fixing the amount of the *ἔδνα*; and, as he was to receive them, he would see to it, that the *ἔδνα* were as large as possible, *πολλὰ μάλ'*. But the greater the *ἔδνα* to the father, the greater the glory of the daughter, inasmuch as she became *ἀλφεσίβοιος*, and her parents *μυρί' ἔλοντο* (cf. *ο* 367). Hence *α* 278 = *β* 197 cannot be severed from the preceding line, and the two together express an inducement for Penelope to return that is indicated in the words of *α* 276 *μέγα δυναμένοιο*.

Now if we retain the line *πολλὰ μάλ'*, *κ.τ.λ.* in the two passages, how is the clause *ὅσσα ἔοικε κ.τ.λ.* to be interpreted? a question which has to be answered, even if we regard the line as un-Homeric, for it must have been intended to mean something. The interpretation 'as many as should go with a beloved daughter' requires *φίλῃ ἐπὶ παιδὶ ἕ.*, a collocation quite admissible by the rules of Homeric verse, but not read by the MSS. Ameis-Hentze take *ἐπὶ παιδὸς* in a local sense, 'bei einem Kinde,' but such a construction would be inadmissible, even if we followed them in regarding the line as un-Homeric. Further, if we wish to retain the line, we must make it square with what we know from other passages, viz. that the *ἔδνα* were the bride price paid to the father. The wording of the line (*ὅσσα*, not *οἷα*) excludes the view accepted by Zuretti, that no more need be meant, than that a portion of the *ἔδνα* were given by the father to the daughter. Besides, there seems to be no evidence whatever in Greek custom for Maine's view, *Early History of Institutions*, p. 324, that among early Aryan communities a portion of the bride price commonly went to the bride, and was the origin of the separate property of married women. In Homer there is no connection traceable between *ἔδνα* and *μείλια*. It would rather seem that, as women became less valuable, what was the exception in Homeric times became the rule, viz. that an eligible suitor should have the bride *ἀνάεδνον*, and enriched with a dowry. This dowry the Law of Gortyna which gives the daughters a right to share with the sons in the paternal estate, treats as a substitute for the daughter's share in

the paternal inheritance (iv. 50, and p. 116, Bücheler-Zitelmann).

Giseke's interpretation avoids these difficulties. He proposes (see Ebeling's *Lexicon*, *s.v.* *ἐπί* p. 451b) to give *ἐπί* a final sense: the gifts of the suitors should accompany them 'ut ematur filia.' But his one Homeric parallel for this (I. 602) is insufficient and uncertain. Aristarchus and HL read *ἐπὶ δώρων | ἔρχεο*, but A and other MSS. give *δώροις*; *δώρῳ*, accepted by Van Leeuwen and Da Costa, may be the original of both readings.

However, there is, I think, another course, viz. to take *φίλης παιδός* as a genitive of price dependent on *ὅσσα* (*ἕδνα*). There would be no objection to the genitive in such a sentence as '*ὅσα ἕδνα φίλης παιδὸς παρασκευάζεσθαι ἔοικε, τόσα ἀρτυνέουσιν*, and therefore none to it in '*ἕδνα ἀρτυνέουσιν, ὅσα φ. π. π. ἔ.*' By the word *παρασκευάζεσθαι* I have indicated the meaning that I wish to get from *ἐπὶ—ἕπεσθαι*. I refer it to √*sep*. This root is limited to divine service in the Rig-Veda (cf. Leaf, *Journ. Phil.* xiv. 248), but herein is no sufficient reason against our recognising (cf. Fick, *Wb.*[4] i. 138) that *ἕπειν* in *ξ* 195 *ἐπὶ ἔργον ἕποιεν* etc. is not from the √*seq*. of *ἕπεσθαι* 'to accompany,' and of (P 190, *ξ* 33 *ποσὶ κραιπνοῖσι*) *μετασπών* 'rushing after' and of (*πότμον*, etc.) *ἐπισπεῖν* or *ἐφέψειν* 'to attain to' (cf. Leaf, *l.l.* p. 249), but from √*sep*. 'betreibe, besorge.' Whether our *ἐπὶ—ἕπεσθαι* is passive or middle, is hard to decide. The passive may find a Greek parallel in the expressions Δ 314 *γούναθ' ἕποιτο*, *υ* 237 *φ* 202 *χεῖρες ἕπονται*, in which Leaf (*l.l.* p. 242) is inclined to see a proper passive of *ἕπειν*, meaning 'to be wielded.' The middle would find parallels in the Rig-Veda, *e.g.* sápante abhí rātím 'they prepare a gift' (see Grassmann *Lex. z. R.V.* col. 1472): *ἐπί* (=Sk. *ápi*) has supplanted **ebhí* (=Sk. *abhí*), according to Delbrück, *Vergl. Synt.* i. p. 676.

There remains the question whether the suitors or the relatives *γάμον τεύξουσι κ.τ.λ.* The words *γ. τ.* seem rather pointless, if the suitors are intended, as they are only too willing to arrange a marriage as things are, *i.e.* with Penelope in Ithaca; but the relatives would be better able to influence matters, if she were with them. It is no objection to this view that of the three verbs *τεύξουσιν, ἀρτυνέουσιν, ἕπεσθαι*, only the last, if any, is middle. In *β* 53 *αὐτὸς ἐεδνώσαιτο θύγατρα* the argument is that Icarius would better protect his interests, if the suitors dealt directly with him; but here the important point is that Penelope's interests would be served by her going home, inasmuch as the *ἕδνα* would be more, and the greater the *ἕδνα* to her relatives, the greater the glory reflected on her. For the use of the article to denote persons not explicitly mentioned before, but only indicated in the expression 'to the hall of her father' (*α* 276 *ἐς μέγαρον πατρός*, *β* 195 *ἐς πατρός*) cf. *γ* 4 *οἱ δὲ Πύλον...ἶξον· τοὶ δ'* (sc. *Πύλιοι*) *κ.τ.λ.*, and see Ebeling's *Lexicon*, vol. ii. p. 4 *s.v.* *ὁ* C*γ*. The interference of other relatives than the father in settling the marriage is represented as possible in Athene's false message:—

o 16
ἤδη γάρ ῥα πατήρ τε κασίγνητοί τε κέλονται
Εὐρυμάχῳ γήμασθαι· ὁ γὰρ περιβάλλει ἅπαντας
μνηστῆρας δώροισι καὶ ἐξώφελλεν ἕεδνα,

where by the way an aorist seems necessary. *ἐξώφειλεν* would be a regular form, and, its *-ει-* not being a diphthong, would once have been identical in writing, though not in speech, with the form in our text, both being written with *ε* followed by a single *λ*.

C. M. Mulvany.

ON THE INTERPRETATION OF AESCH. *AGAM.* 69–71.

Aesch. *Agam.* 69–71.

οὔθ' ὑποκλαίων οὔθ' ὑπολείβων
οὔτε δακρύων ἀπύρων ἱερῶν
ὀργὰς ἀτενεῖς παραθέλξει.

It is the object of this paper to propose a simple explanation for an important passage in Aeschylus, that has been darkened by errors of scribes and by modern commentators who take no account of the facts of Greek ritual. But if it is hazardous to hope that a new theory can be established and accepted, something may be gained by proving that all the received explanations of the text are untenable.

Before dealing with these in detail, we may gather one or two facts concerning

these lines and their context that most people will accept as obvious. The words allude to the impossibility of assuaging some one's wrath by a libation: therefore the poet has in mind some divine wrath, and not the wrath of any mortal, such as Clytaemnestra resenting the sacrifice of Iphigenia, as Paley is inclined to maintain in a very careless note: it is scarcely necessary to say that libations are intended for the deity. In the next place, if the words have any special allusion at all, they point to Paris and not to Agamemnon or any other sinner. The poetic logic of the context and the whole ode proves this. The chorus begins with reflections on the sin of Paris who has violated the rites of Zeus Xenios; the Atreidae are compared to the desolate vultures who have been robbed of their young: and 'Zeus will send a late-avenging Fury against the transgressors.' The first part of the ode in fact is penetrated with the belief that the cause of the Achaeans is the cause of God and will ultimately triumph. It is not until line 131 that the singer touches on the crime of Agamemnon, the immolation of his daughter, which may bring retribution on himself and on his people. Looking now at the various translations that have been offered of this mysterious sentence, we may group together (A) those which agree on the whole in the interpretation of *ἀπύρων ἱερῶν*, the words that are the key of the whole passage, as a phrase signifying unhallowed or inauspicious offerings. Some who thus interpret the phrase explain the *ὀργὰς ἀτενεῖς ἀπύρων ἱερῶν* as (1) the wrath of the gods or Clytaemnestra against Agamemnon on account of the unhallowed sacrifice of Iphigenia; this is the view of Hermann, Donaldson, Dindorf, and Paley. Others, *e.g.* Schneidewin, Keck, Wecklein, and Verrall, interpret the phrase as (2) the stubborn wrath of the sacrifice that will not burn, all of them, except Verrall, referring it to the inauspicious marriage rites of Paris and Helen. Another mode of interpretation (B) is that which explains *ἀπύρων ἱερῶν* as unburnt and therefore unoffered sacrifice, a concrete in place of the more abstract expression 'neglect of religious duties': thus Klausen refers it to the neglect on the part of Paris of the laws of hospitality, of the rites of Zeus Xenios. Prof. Robinson Ellis makes a suggestion in the *Classical Review* (1889 p. 132) that the words allude to the story preserved by Dionysius of Halicarnassus from a work by Menecrates of Xanthus to the effect that Paris had excluded Aeneas from certain sacrifices of the Priamid family; and he would translate the whole sentence thus 'neither by counter-offering (*ὑποκαίων*) nor by counter-libation nor by tears shall Paris soothe the steadfast anger (of Aeneas) against him for sacrificial rites withheld.' Lastly we may mention the interpretation (C) of the questionable words which Conington, following Schneider, has maintained: *ἄπυρα ἱερά* are victims that are not victims in the ordinary sense of the word, victims not offered by the fire, but by the sword, the dead on the battle field; 'Paris will not soften the stubborn wrath of heaven against the doomed victims of the sword, that is against himself and his friends' (Conington); or 'the fierce desire of Zeus and Fate for victims to be offered on the field of battle' (Schneider). Among the daring phrases of Aeschylus, we are familiar with 'the unbarking dogs of Zeus' as a synonym for eagles, 'the blameless poison of bees' for honey, 'the voiceless messenger' for the dust; in all these cases the epithet denies that the noun possesses a quality that in its strict sense it must possess; therefore on the supposition that all sacrifices were with fire, a fireless sacrifice would be a sacrifice in the figurative sense, perhaps a sacrifice of the sword.

Now a very slight knowledge of Greek ritual is sufficient to convince us that all these interpretations of *ἄπυρα ἱερά* are quite indefensible. The main distinction in Greek sacrifice is between the animal offerings and the bloodless offerings of fruit, cereals and liquids, such as water, honey and milk. Of the former we may say that they were almost always burnt, and were called generally *ἔμπυρα*, fire being the more civilised process of conveying the offering to the deity; it may be true that the ancient votaries of Dionysos *Ὠμάδιος* devoured the raw flesh of the victim as a sacrament; we hear of horses being offered as victims by being driven into the water and drowned, and according to Plutarch (*Quaest. Graec.* xxxi.) the Eretrian women in their Thesmophoria did not use fire for the sacrificial flesh, but dried it in the sun. Still the term *ἔμπυρα* would on the whole apply to the blood-offering and the animal victim. On the other hand, the name, *ἄπυρα* would be fitly applied to the larger number of the bloodless offerings; for though cakes or corn might sometimes be burnt on the altar, (Porph. *de Abstin.* 2, 17, quoting Menander) fruit certainly was not; and we may conclude that the 'sober offerings,' *τὰ νηφάλια*, which were frequent

in Greek ritual, were also ἄπυρα,[1] for they were identified with μελίσπονδα, libations of honey (Plut. *Moral.* 672 C). Now the bloodless offerings were certainly common in Greece; we hear of them as proper to the worship of Zeus Ὕπατος at Athens, of Artemis in Samos, of Sosipolis at Elis; the νηφάλια were consecrated to the Erinyes, Mnemosyne, the Muses, Eos, Helios, Selene, the Nymphs, Aphrodite Ourania, Zeus Γεωργός, Poseidon and even Dionysos.[2] What dictated the choice of sacrifice is a doubtful question which need not now be discussed; the same deity might be often worshipped now with ἔμπυρα, now with ἄπυρα ἱερά. What is important is to note that certain of the ancients regarded the bloodless as the more acceptable sacrifice of the two kinds. The altar at Delos on which no blood was shed was called the pious altar (Porph. *de Abst.* 2, 28); and Pausanias contrasts the innocent ritual of Zeus Ὕπατος at Athens to whom πέμματα alone were offered, with the cruel rites of the Arcadian Zeus Lycaeus. Now not only is it clear that the name ἄπυρα ἱερὰ would apply to a large portion of these innocent sacrifices, but—what is more important—we know that it actually was applied. The fragment of Euripides (904), which the commentators have strangely neglected, proves the meaning of ἄπυρα ἱερά and disproves all the interpretations of the passage in the *Agamemnon* hitherto mentioned: the fragment contains a pious prayer to Zeus and a profound religious thought:

> Σοὶ τῷ πάντων μεδέοντι χοὴν
> πελανόν τε φέρω, Ζεὺς εἴτ' Ἀΐδης
> ὀνομαζόμενος στέργεις· σὺ δέ μοι
> θυσίαν ἄπυρον παγκαρπείας
> δέξαι πλήρη προχυθεῖσαν.

The sacrifice of all the fruits of the earth is here 'the fireless sacrifice,' which is regarded as the holier; and the votary of Zeus Idaeos who speaks in the fragment of the Κρῆτες boasts of his austere abstinence from animal food. We may now compare the passage of equal importance in Pindar's Olympian ode (vii. 89–90): τεῦξαν δ' ἀπύροις ἱεροῖς ἅλσος ἐν ἀκροπόλει. So far from these words justifying the interpretation of ἄπυρα ἱερά as an inauspicious sacrifice, the legend proves the reverse. Combining the somewhat obscure statement of it in Pindar with the fuller account in Diodorus (v. 56) we have the following story: the Rhodians or the Heliadae, on the occasion of the birth of Athena, were informed by Helios that the community that was the first to offer sacrifice to Athena would enjoy her perpetual presence among them; in a moment of carelessness, as Pindar's words may mean, and as Diodorus expressly says, the Rhodians offered her a fireless sacrifice; and Diodorus adds that Cecrops offered her a sacrifice with fire on the Acropolis of Athens: and that both states maintained this distinction of ritual down to his own time. Diodorus nowhere says but may be understood to imply, that Athena preferred Athens, because, as we find almost invariably in her ritual, she preferred animal food. But the Rhodians certainly did not regard their ἄπυρα ἱερὰ as inauspicious, or they would not have maintained the ritual; nor did Pindar regard them as inauspicious, but on the contrary, as the cause of the divine favours which Zeus and Athena showered upon the island.[3] That ἄπυρα may have sometimes connoted a more ideal sacrifice, even in the latest period of Greek literature, is suggested by a passage in Philo, βωμοῖς ἀπύροις περὶ οὓς ἀρεταὶ χορεύουσι γέγηθεν ὁ θεὸς ἀλλ' οὐ πολλῷ πυρὶ φλέγουσιν (*de Plaut.* ii. p. 154).

Looking then at these facts that show the prevalence of ἄπυρα ἱερά in Greece and the high estimation in which they were often held, we must reject all the interpretations in class A; for Aeschylus would have committed an outrage on Greek religion, had he used the expression as a synonym for 'unhallowed' rites. The cause of the error has been partly the wrong association of the phrase with the line in the *Antigone* (1006) ἐκ δὲ θυμάτων Ἥφαιστος οὐκ ἔλαμπε—which belongs to Teiresias' description of the ill-omened signs in the burnt offering: no doubt it was a bad omen if a bright flame refused to gleam from the victim when the fire was kindled: but such rejected victims were never called ἄπυρα ἱερά, nor does the passage in the *Antigone* bear at all on the

[1] Liddell and Scott, *s.v.* νηφάλια, suppose that these might be offered with fire, but this is an error arising from a wrong interpretation of the Scholiast's statement on *Oed. Col.* 100.

[2] *Vide* my *Cults of the Greek States*, Vol. 1, p. 88).

[3] Philostratus in his description of the picture of Ἀθηνᾶς γοναί gives us the same story; and he calls the Rhodian Sacrifices ἄπυρα καὶ ἀτελῆ, not because such sacrifices were usually 'imperfect,' but because in this special case it failed to win the highest blessings, though Rhodes was abundantly blessed for that sacrifice. The sacrifices offered at Thebes by the commander of the horse at the tomb of Dirce were ἄπυροι ἱερουργίαι. *Plut.* 578 B: it is needless to say that a state-ritual like this was not intended to be 'inauspicious.'

point concerning the auspiciousness of a fruit-offering for which no fire was needed.

The second group of interpretations which would explain *ἄπυρα ἱερά* as neglected or unoffered sacrifices is met by an equally fatal objection; if a great number of sacrifices were regarded as duly and most righteously offered without fire, as we know they were, how could *ἄπυρα* signify 'unoffered'? Such an interpretation might at first glance seem to get support from the gloss in Hesychius s.v. *Ἀθύτου· Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Μυσοῖς*. It would, however, require more than the authority of Hesychius to make us believe that Sophocles could use a phrase in a sense contradictory to its use in Pindar and Euripides and to the well-known facts of Greek ritual. But we need not suspect Hesychius or criticise Sophocles; for we are absolutely ignorant of the application of the word, or of the noun to which it was attached, in the *Μυσοί*. The word *ἄπυρος* was applied to many other things; it might even have been applied to an animal that was not to be sacrificed or not yet sacrificed. All we gather from Hesychius that concerns us now is that the phrase *ἄπυρα ἱερά* did not occur in the passage he was quoting. As regards interpretation C, it stands self-condemned. All dogs can bark; therefore 'an unbarking dog' is no real dog. But many sacrifices were without fire; therefore a fireless sacrifice was none the less a real and literal sacrifice.

In fact the whole expression *ὀργὰς ἀτενεῖς ἀπύρων ἱερῶν* if the words are to be taken together must mean *either* 'the stubborn wrath (of the Gods) on account of a sacrifice of fruits or liquids'; but there is no story in myth or history about any personage or community incurring the wrath of the gods by this innocent ritual; the *ἄπυρα ἱερά* could not have been understood as an allusion to the offerings made by Paris on the occasion of his marriage, the proper name for the wedding ritual being *προτέλεια*, and the sacrifice being, as far as we know, a burnt sacrifice of animals: *or* 'the wrath *of* the sacrifice of fruits or liquids.' Now the personification of sacrifice at all, which such an interpretation implies, is entirely alien to Greek religious thought, though familiar to the Vedic religion: and 'the stubborn wrath of a sacrifice of fruits' is simple nonsense. Akin to this last interpretation is that of some older commentators, Schütz for instance, who thought that the phrase might signify the wrath of the Furies, because the Furies were sometimes worshipped with *νηφάλια* or *ἄπυρα* and the rite might stand for the divinity of the rite. The interpretation is really more scientific than those of more modern scholars, and yet it is obviously wrong. Even if the word for the rite could be used as a synonym for the divinity, which I believe impossible in Greek religious phraseology, yet the 'fireless rites' could not be an intelligible synonym for the Furies, since a score or so of other divinities preferred the ritual without fire, and the Furies sometimes partook of animal food at the sacrificial meal.

It seems then that the words *ἀπύρων ἱερῶν* cannot be construed at all with *ὀργὰς ἀτενεῖς*. It has been the persistent attempt to do so which has long made havoc of an important passage. Still less can they be taken with *οὔτε δακρύων* which precedes them in the MS. Three courses then are open to us. In despair we may believe that some words have fallen out after *οὔτε δακρύων*, which would have explained *ἀπύρων ἱερῶν*; but if they have, we shall never convince ourselves or others that we have found them. Or we may regard *οὔτε δακρύων* as a corruption of some obliterated or misunderstood phrase; Keck's emendation *Πάρις Ἡραίων* leaves the construction and sense as hopeless as ever; Ahren's suggestion *οὔτ' ἀναρύων* 'drawing off liquids' gives us a word that might possibly be appropriate to the fireless offering which often consisted wholly of liquids, but the verb *ἀναρύω* has no sacrificial use; *οὐδ' αὐερύων* is a good ritualistic expression, only as it is used of the sacrifice of animals it cannot be constructed with or connected with *ἀπύρων ἱερῶν*. Or lastly, until the palmary emendation can be proposed, we may expunge the words *οὔτε δακρύων* wholly from the text as most editors, without fairly considering the question, have already done. Obviously if Aeschylus had already written *ὑποκλαίων*, he could not have committed so foolish a tautology as to have written *οὔτε δακρύων* after it; but as it is almost certain that he did not write *ὑποκλαίων*, we cannot dismiss *οὔτε δακρύων* thus. The phrase must be tried on its own merits. We have seen that standing where it does it renders the following words entirely untranslateable; and if we preserve it in its present place we must assume a lacuna. But the phrase must be regarded with the greatest suspicion by those who are familiar with Greek religious phraseology and religious thought. In a Christian narrative the repentant sinner might naturally be said to go away in secret, and weep bitterly: but with Greek methods of atonement for sin weeping and tears have nothing to do: in the days of

Homer (vide *Il.* ix. 499) as in the days of Aeschylus, the sinner among the Greeks who wished to clear himself would approach the gods with 'incense and goodly prayers, libation, and the smoke of sacrifice': if he prayed to Zeus Meilichios or the Furies, he might proffer his prayer with a fireless ritual; if to Zeus Phyxius or to Apollo at Delphi, an animal sacrifice would be in place.

In the elaborate description of the cleansing of Jason and Medea from the sin of kindred bloodshed in *Apoll. Rhod.* iv. 702, in Pausanias' account of the fruitless remorse of the Spartan King for slaying the Byzantine maiden, and of the means of atonement which he sought, tears of repentance are nowhere mentioned. And in the fragment of the Niobe of Aeschylus, a passage very similar to our present one, concerning the implacable character of Death, about whom a modern poet might say 'prayers and tears and gifts are fruitless all,' the ancient poet thinks only of the usual mode of appeasing deities, and says 'Alone among the gods Death loves not gifts, nor can'st thou win ought by sacrifice or libation; there is no altar raised to him, no holy chant.' In fact public ritual, not secret repentance was the usual *καθάρσια* for the Greek sinner; and, though the most advanced thinkers may occasionally have maintained that the pure heart and the good will were better than sacrifice, never, so far as I am aware, are tears mentioned as efficacious. Now Aeschylus was more conversant with Greek ritual religious thought and phraseology than most other poets. If his chorus of Argive elders wished to say, as it is clear that in this passage they did wish, that by none of the usual modes of atonement could the sinner whom they have in mind assuage the stubborn wrath of the gods, then they would most naturally say—by no manner of sacrifice can he do so: and if they wished further to specify the usual modes of sacrifice, they could not express themselves better than by saying 'neither by burnt-sacrifice nor by a libation of fireless sacrifice can he assuage God's stubborn wrath.' And this simple statement is what I believe Aeschylus to have actually made in this place. We must read *ὑποκάων* and *ἐπιλείβων*, very slight changes of the MS. text, which have long been made, the first by Casaubon the second by Schütz, though the value of the first and the inevitableness of the second have not always been recognised, nor have they always been rightly translated by the many editors who have adopted them. *Ὑποκαίειν* would be a ritualistic word such as we want in this passage, exactly describing the act of the sacrificer who lit the fire on the altar under the victim; so that the word would be generally applicable to burnt sacrifice. If Aeschylus really used the word here, it could convey no other save this literal and simple sense to the Greek audience. It is true that we do not find the word, so far as I am aware, used elsewhere in reference to sacrifice; but we may compare the curious title *ὑπεκκαυστρία* borne by the priestess of Athena at Soloi (Plut. *Quaest. Graec.* 3). In a sentence where the expression *ἄπυρα ἱερά* was to be used to designate one of the two species of sacrifice, and a verb was wanted to denote precisely the burnt offering, no other verb was so suitable for Aeschylus' purpose as *ὑποκαίειν*: therefore we may believe he would have used it, even if it had not been so applied before, which is more than we know.

As regards *ὑπολείβω* it is almost a *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον*, with no possible meaning relevant to this place. I do not consider that it could possibly signify counter-libations (Robinson Ellis) or secret libations: it could only naturally mean to make a libation underneath something else: but a libation was always made on the top of something else, on the top of the victim or cake, or at least on the top of the altar; nothing was ever offered on the top of the libation. This fact has such ample literary and archaeological evidence that it may be sufficient to refer to *Il.* 1. 462: *καῖε δ' ἐπὶ σκίζῃς ὁ γέρων, ἐπὶ δ' αἴθοπα οἶνον λείβε.* (cf. *Verg.* vi., 256 and *C.I.A.* iii. 73). *Ἐπιλείβων* exactly describes the process of ritual and was a word sanctified by Homeric use; *ὑπολείβω* describes no known process of ritual, and is a slight error due to the common carelessness of the scribe whose eye was confused by the first three letters of the preceding verb. Now with *ὑποκάων* and *ἐπιλείβων*, restored and *οὔτε δακρύων* expunged, I venture to suggest what has not been suggested before, so far as I know, that the phrase *ἀπύρων ἱερῶν* should be taken with *ἐπιλείβων* towards which word it naturally gravitates. If we can thus translate the three words, 'making a libation of, or from, fireless offerings,' the sense is perfect, for the *ἄπυρα ἱερά* were usually liquids, *μελίσπονδα* or *νηφάλια*; and I do not feel that such a genitive is a grammatical solecism, as we have such a phrase as *πάσσε δ' ἁλός* in the *Iliad* and in Lucian's dialogues. If this were granted, we shall gain a simple meaning for a vexed sentence by an inter-

pretation that is entirely in accordance with usual Greek ideas and practice; and we shall be freed from monstrous fancies about the wrath of sacrifices that will not burn, or from the necessity of charging Aeschylus with writing mythological puzzles. Lastly those who reject *οὔτε δακρύων* may explain the interpolation either as an unprovoked intrusion of an alien idea into the text, or as a marginal gloss written after *ὑποκάων*, the rarer word, had been changed to the more familiar *ὑποκλαίων*. But if the general reasons which I have given for excluding any mention of tears in this passage be unconvincing (and general reasons, proving a negative, are rarely wholly convincing) then we may at least take *οὔτε δακρύων* away from its present hopeless position between the libation and the fireless sacrifice, and place it at the beginning of the sentence, where its position would be far less incongruous; this would neither affect the metre nor my interpretation of the remainder of the sentence.

LEWIS R. FARNELL.

LATIN *CORTINA* 'POT': *CORTEX* 'BARK.'

I FIND the following entry in Wharton's *Etyma Latina*: 'cortīna curtīna caldron: fr. *curtus* 'cut down,' not tall like the *amphora*, cf. Lucr. 4, 1026 dolia curta.' Inasmuch however, as Lucretius is speaking of *broken chamber-pots* I find nothing to defend this derivation from the charge of being far-fetched.

To justify the suggestion of my title I note the fact that cooking-vessels were made of basketry in classical antiquity[1] as well as by our savages of North America.[2]

The objection will arise that *cortīna* can not be derived from **cortegna* : *cortex*, which must give **cortīgna*.[3]

The following words however seem to show the resolution of *$a^x gn$*, *$a^x cn$* into *$ā^x n$* in Latin, viz. *fēnum* 'hay': *φαγ-εῖν* 'eat,' *fēnus* 'interest': Sk. *bhaj-* 'share,' *lēna* 'panderess': *λαγ-νός* 'salacious': *Mānes* 'deified ancestors': *māgnus* 'great,' cf. *māiores* 'ancestors.' All of these words are right completely *isolated* in Latin, while *dignus* 'worthy' and the like may have been influenced by *decet* 'it becomes.'[4] The only apparently completely isolated word I am acquainted with that shows permanent *gn* is *ignis* 'fire,' and I have, I trust, made it probable that *ignis* 'lightning-dart' belongs to *agere* 'drive' but has formed besides a popular relationship with *ictus* 'lightning.'[5]

Now *cortīna* may be referred for its phonetics to the above group where *$a^x gn$*, *$a^x cn$* pass into *$ā^x n$*. The etymologies here proposed do not stand or fall however by the phonetic process which I claim is exhibited in them. Nay, *luna* 'moon' shows in an old Latin inscription the form *losna*, for which by comparison with Avest. *raoxšna* 'shining,' O. Pruss. *lauxnos* 'stars' the base **louqsno-* 'shining' has been set up. One may therefore write for *fenum*, say, a base **bhag-s-no-* and thus the phonetics of *fenum* will not violate the phonetics of *dignus*. I have no quarrel with writing a base like **louqs-no* for which warrant can be found in several actually existing forms in various ones of the derived languages; and the claim of a base **bhag-s-no* has the Sk. root *bhakṣ* 'eat' to rest on, but I could feel no confidence in a base **maĝh-s-ni* for *Manes* because of Vedic *makṣ-ú* 'quick,' Lat. *mox* 'soon,' and I feel a similar hesitation in deriving *vanus* 'vain' from **vac-s-no* 'made empty,' rather than **vac-no-*. I have claimed that the change of *$-a^x gn-$* to *$-ā^x n-$* took place in isolated words only, and this seems to me much more simple than the assumption of an extension of all the roots involved by an *-s-*.

An illustration of the various devices used by scholars to produce rigid phonetic

[1] Guhl u. Kohner, *Leben d. Griechen u Römer*, p. 200.

[2] Mason, *Woman's Share in Primitive Culture*, p. 101.

[3] I cite from the *American Journal of Philology* xvii. 180 the following footnote of Mr. L. Horton-Smith as a recent utterance of the prevailing phonetic school: '*vānus* cannot come from the form **vac-nus* as suggested by King and Cookson—*vacnus* must have yielded *vagnus*, cf. *ilignus* : *ilex*, *salignus* : *salix*, *dignus* from **dic-nus*.

[4] Cf. the author, *Proceedings Am. Phil. Assoc.* Special Session 1894, liii. In the list there given I propose the following new and, I believe, indubitable cognations, *segnis* 'lazy': *sagina* 'fatling' (cf. *pinguis* 'fat': *piger* 'lazy'), *signum* 'mark statue': *secare* 'cut, carve,' *lignum* 'firewood': *ligare* 'bind up,' cf. *δεται* 'faggots : *δέω* 'bind.'

[5] Cf. the author, *Am. Jr. Phil.* xvii. 24 *sq.*, and add Ov. *Trist.* I. iii. 11, *Iovis ignibus ictus*.

regularity may be taken from *agmen* beside *exāmen*. Stolz[1] makes the law *agm* gives *ām*; thus *exāmen* is regular, while *āgmen* is for **āgimen*. Brugman[2] calls in 'apt ablaut's artful aid' and derives *exāmen* from **exāgmen*, while *āgmen* is from **āgmen;* Horton-Smith,[3] however, writes **exag-s-men*, without explaining why we do not have **āmen* from **ag-s-men*. I confess that I can not see why any one of this swarm of phonetic explanations is superior to mine, viz. that **examen* 'swarm of bees,' is isolated from *exigo* 'drive out' to a much greater degree than *agmen* 'troop' is from *agere* 'lead.'[4]

Now the isolation of *cortīna* 'pot' from *cortex* 'bark' would be perfect after civilization had advanced beyond the basket-pot.

I note here in passing how *ilignus* 'oaken' and *salignus* 'made of willow' have provided a suffix for *abiegnus* 'made of fir.' It may well be however that the suffix *-gnus* was popularly associated with *-genus* 'sort' in composition.

As regards the phonetics of the group *a^{x}gn* in Latin I am responsible for the suggestion that it sometimes results in *a^{x}mn*, as well as in *ā^{x}n*.[5] I do not contend that one of these processes was taking place under the same circumstances as the other. My two most cogent examples are *femur* 'thigh' and *vomer* 'ploughshare.' Operating with the genitive *feminis* I suppose it to have developed from **fag^{w}-nos* and to be akin to πῶχυς 'fore-arm,' Sk. *bāhús* 'fore-foot.' For mixtures of *u*-stems with *r-n*-stems I cite the following examples γόνυ γόνατος (*γονϝατος), Sk. *jánu jánunas;* δόρυ δόρατος (δόρϝατος), Sk. *dā́ru dárunas;* further Sk. *manú*, Ger. *mann* <**manw-* with a long stem **manwan* represented in Gothic; Sk *dhánu*, with a by-form *dhánvan-*.[6] Similarly we can infer from *feminis* a stem **fagwen* alongside of **bhāĝhu* in Sk. *bāhú-*. Our inferences for *vomer* are to be drawn from ὀφνίς ploughshare, ὄφατα· δεσμοὶ ἀρότρων (Hesychius), O. Pruss. *wagnis*, O.H.G. *waganso*. These related forms permit us to operate with a Latin gen. **vog^{w}nos*, whence **vomnis*, under whose influence the normal nom. **vover* has shifted to *vomer*.

I regard these two examples as entirely cogent to prove that Italic *gwn g^{w}n* gave Lat. *mn*.

My interpretation, now, of the kinship of *vānus* ('empty' whence) 'idle' with *vacare* 'be empty' is that Italic *a^{x}gn* (*cn*) gives *ā^{x}n* in Latin, while the relation of *fem-in-is* : Sk. *bāhú-s*, and of *vomer* : ὀφ-ν-ίς teaches that Italic *g^{w}n* gives *mn*. I do not venture to state these 'laws' in Aryan terms of 'palatal' and 'velar.' The interchange of 'palatals' and 'velars' at the close of the Aryan period is an undeniable fact.[7] It is believed by Bartholomae[8] that this fact disposes of the theory of three gutturals. It seems to me to almost dispose of the theory of two gutturals. The guttural was a forward guttural (*i.e.* 'palatal') if contiguous with palatal sounds; it was a rounded-back-guttural ('velar') when contiguous with rounded-back sounds. Obviously every word-group would tend to a fixation of the guttural either as forward or as rounded-back, or else leave a pure guttural according to the prevailing phonetic environment of the guttural. This threefold differentiation could hardly be expected, however, to be thorough-going. Thus we account very simply for all the perplexing interchanges in the guttural-series.

The great trouble with linguistic science in its latest phases is that it works on the assumption that a phonetic change is always an accomplished fact, and blinds its eyes to the long periods of fluctuating tendency in which a folk divides itself into conservative and radical word-users. The fluctuation between *r* and *l* in Sanskrit is a case in point. This fact is undeniable.[9] You may call this if you will dialect, but it is dialect of the individual, the recognition of which seriously impairs the inviolability claimed for the phonetic laws.

The *facts* of the primitive period are, alas, beyond documentary substantiation, but the fluctuation of 'palatals' with 'velars' was possibly of the same nature as the fluctuation between *r* and *l* in Sanskrit in words that show only an *l* in the related languages. Who shall say that 'palatal' and 'velar' may not be but *extreme* variations of a guttural *mean*?

[1] In Iwan Müller's *Handbuch*[2], ii. § 65, 2.
[2] *Grundriss* i. § 506.
[3] *Am. Jour. Phil.* xvii. 180.
Proc. Am. Phil. Assoc. 1895, lxiv.
[5] *Proc. Am. Phil. Assoc.* Special Session 1894, lii.
[6] From Pedersen, Kuhn's *Zeitschrift* 32, 253.

[7] Cf. Brugmann, *Gr.* i. 344 *sq.*, Bechtel, *Hauptprobleme* 377 *sq.*, Noreen, *Urgerm. Lautlehre*, 199. I note that the *vomer-* group just discussed with a 'velar' (**vohg-*) is certainly cognate to the root of *veho* 'ride' with a palatal (**vegh-*).
[8] *Grundriss d. Iran. Philologie* i. 22.
[9] 'The semivowels *r* and *l* are very widely interchangeable in Sanskrit, both in roots and in suffixes, and even in prefixes; there are few roots containing a (*sic*) *l* which do not show also forms with *r*; words written with the one letter are found in other texts, or in other parts of the same text, written with the other.' Whitney *Sk. Gr.*[2] § 53 *b*.

In all this matter too little notice has been paid to the function of the hearing ear. Our English language with its single *n* designates the sounds for the hearing ear quite sufficiently; the Sanskrit exactness of *ñ*, *ṅ*, *ṇ* and *n* is a finesse due to the speaking tongue. The hearing ear in all of these cases takes cognizance of nasality, the speaking voice makes the closure for the nasal at a point convenient for the neighbouring consonants. So, to my mind, the gutturals shift parasitically to suit contiguous vowels. The guttural would tend to permanence for any group of words so far as its members were felt to be akin, but a change in the character of the contiguous vowel would form a counter-tendency, the stronger in proportion to the isolation of any word from its group in meaning.

EDWIN W. FAY.

Lexington, Va.

ETYMOLOGY OF LATIN *INGENS*.

MR. FAY (*Class. Rev.* Feb. 1897, p. 12) gives two objections to the connection of *ingens* with γένος, etc. 'compounded with an indeterminate preposition.' As neither reason concerns the preposition itself, it may be concluded that it is unobjectionable. It is curious that he should not have mentioned that the last syllable of the reduplicated stem γιγαντ- is the exact phonetic equivalent of the Latin *-gent-*. In the face of this it is undesirable to connect *ingens* with the Greek ἄγᾱν, which of course looks like the accusative of a substantive ἄγᾱ (borrowed in Attic) connected with ἄγαμαι. I hold that there is not a single certain example of initial Skt. *ă* or initial Grk. *ἀ* occurring in words akin to forms beginning with *m* followed by a vowel.

C. A. M. FENNELL.

ON ARISTOTLE'S *POETICS* c. 25.

AR. *Poet.* XXV. 6. οἷον καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἔφη αὐτὸς μὲν οἵους δεῖ ποιεῖν, Εὐριπίδην δὲ οἷοι εἰσίν.

Prof. Butcher thus translates this sentence, 'just as Sophocles said that he drew men as they ought to be drawn; Euripides, as they are.' In the first clause he understands ποιεῖν with δεῖ, herein agreeing with Dr. Verrall, who in the *Classical Review* for 1889 (vol. iii. p. 27), in a notice of Berlage's *De Euripide Philosopho*, writes as follows upon this sentence, 'it seems that the author renders this *dictum*, according to the strangely persistent error, as if the infinitive to be supplied with δεῖ were εἶναι. This is not merely impossible by the form of the sentence, but makes Sophocles' criticism absurdly untrue. The infinitive supplied is ποιεῖν: Sophocles admitted reality only within the limits imposed by poetic art, or rather by the Greek conception of dramatic art. Euripides, with or without reason, overstepped those limits.' Before Dr. Verrall, it appears that Welcker also took the sentence in the same way. In a note Prof. Butcher says,[1] 'Vahlen, however, understands εἶναι with δεῖ.' I have not met with any commentator (though I admit there are many I have not seen at all) except the three above named who does *not* understand εἶναι with δεῖ. Dacier, Hurd, Lessing, Twining, Tyrwhitt, Stahr and Prickard all agree on the grammatical construction of the sentence, however much they differ among themselves as to its meaning. The 'error' then, if it is an error, is, as Dr. Verrall remarks, 'strangely persistent,' but is it an error? While agreeing with Dr. Verrall and Prof. Butcher upon the explanation I venture to doubt the correctness of their rendering.

Before dealing with the rendering it is well to consider the meaning which is intended to be conveyed. There are two interpretations given. (1) When Sophocles said he drew men 'as they ought to be' he referred to moral goodness. Thus Dacier

[1] *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*, p. 343, note 3.

translates, 'que Sophocle faisait ses héros, comme ils devaient être, et qu' Euripide les faisait comme ils étaient,' and explains, 'Sophocle tâchait de rendre ses imitations parfaites, en suivant toujours bien plus ce qu' une belle nature était capable de faire, que ce qu'elle faisait. Au lieu qu' Euripide ne travaillait qu'à les rendre semblables, en consultant davantage ce que cette même nature faisait, que ce qu'elle était capable de faire.' This explanation is quoted with approbation and adopted by Twining and Mr. Prickard.[1] It cannot be denied that there are several passages in the *Poetics* that give colour to it, 'Tragedy aims at representing men as better than in actual life (*βελτίους τῶν νῦν*),' and 'Epic poetry agrees with Tragedy in so far as it is an imitation in verse of characters of a higher type (*μίμησις σπουδαίων*),' and again, 'in respect of character there are four things to be aimed at, First, and most important, it must be good (*τὰ ἤθη...ὅπως χρηστὰ ᾖ*)': still, Prof. Butcher shows that these expressions are qualified by others, and this explanation is so opposed to Aristotle's theory of Poetry and Fine Art on the whole, and so contrary to the practice of Homer and Sophocles that it can hardly be the correct one.

(2) That Sophocles referred to his representation of the type and not the individual, the universal not the particular. Bishop Hurd in his commentary on the *Ars Poetica* of Horace explains as follows, 'The meaning is, Sophocles from his more extended commerce with mankind, had enlarged and widened the narrow, partial conception, arising from the contemplation of *particular* characters, into a complete comprehension of the *kind*. Whereas the philosophic Euripides, having been mostly conversant in the academy, when he came to look into life, keeping his eye too intent on single, really existing personages, sunk the *kind* in the *individual*; and so painted his characters naturally indeed, and *truly*, with regard to the objects in view, but sometimes without that general and universally striking likeness which is demanded to the full exhibition of poetical truth.' This explanation is approved by Lessing, and by Stahr, who translates the saying of Sophocles, 'er schildere Menschen wie sie sein müssen, Euripides dagegen, wie sie in die Wirklichkeit sind,' and adds in a note 'nicht *sittlich* bessere, idealere Menschen hat Sophokles nach diesem seinem Ausspruche schildern wollen und geschildert, sondern "künstlerisch wahre," d. h. solche, wie sie nach den Gesetzen der kunst sein müssen.' Dr. Verrall, as above quoted, agrees with this, so does Prof. Butcher, who says, 'the characters of Sophocles answer to the higher dramatic requirements; they are typical of universal human nature in its deeper and abiding aspects; they are ideal, but ideally human.' This explanation is also that suggested by the *Poetics* as a whole and in many passages. I need only quote one from ch. 9, 'Poetry tends to express the universal, history the particular. The universal tells us how a person of given character will on occasion speak or act, according to the law of probability or necessity; and it is this universality at which Poetry aims in giving expressive names to the characters.' There is, no doubt, some difficulty in those expressions of Aristotle that require a certain amount of moral goodness in the characters of tragedy, but Prof. Butcher goes far to reconcile them with the interpretation last enunciated by pointing out, first, that Aristotle does not seem quite to have emancipated himself from some consequences of the ancient opinion that the aim of poetry is moral improvement, and secondly, that the goodness of character required is not really coextensive with moral goodness but that 'the characters portrayed by epic and tragic poetry have their basis in moral goodness; but the goodness is of the heroic order. It is quite distinct from plain, unaspiring virtue. It has nothing in it common or mean. Whatever be the moral imperfections in the characters, they are such as impress our imagination, and arouse the sense of grandeur: we are lifted above the reality of daily life.'[2] If I may be allowed to say so, I agree with Prof. Butcher in his interpretation and in his further explanation. Aristotle does not quite come up to the doctrine of *l'art pour l'art*, but he is much nearer to it than any of his successors in ancient times. I have purposely avoided the use of the word 'ideal,' as it is ambiguous, and indeed is used in two different senses in the passages above quoted from Stahr and Prof. Butcher.

Now we come to the words of our text. Dr. Verrall assumes that if we understand *εἶναι* the reference must be to moral goodness, which reference as he rightly says would be 'absurdly untrue.' But is such a reference necessary? I cannot think so. None of the commentators (as far as I have seen) who adopt the same interpretation as Dr. Verrall find any difficulty in understanding

[1] *Aristotle on the Art of Poetry*, p. 95, note 33.

p. 217.

εἶναι and translating 'as they ought to be,' and even Prof. Butcher says, 'even if we accept this construction [*i.e.* understanding εἶναι], the δεῖ will still be the "ought" of aesthetic obligation, not the moral "ought."' This is, in my judgment, precisely so. I admit that if the sentence were isolated it would not only be natural to understand ποιεῖν, but this would be the only possible construction. But the context makes all the difference. We will then look at the context. At the beginning of c. 25 we read, "With respect to critical difficulties and their solutions, the number and nature of the sources from which they may be drawn may be thus exhibited. The poet being an imitator, like a painter or any other artist, must of necessity imitate one of three objects,—things as they were or are, things as they are said or thought to be, or things as they ought to be (ἢ γὰρ οἷα ἦν ἢ ἔστιν, ἢ οἷά φασιν καὶ δοκεῖ, ἢ οἷα εἶναι δεῖ)." Then, after some remarks upon the two kinds of faults in poetry, sec. 6 goes on, 'Further, if it be objected that the description is not true to fact, the poet may perhaps reply,—"But the objects are as they ought to be," just as Sophocles said that he drew men as they ought to be; Euripides as they are. In this way the objection may be met. If, however, the representation be of neither kind, the poet may answer,—"This is what is commonly said" (πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἐὰν ἐπιτιμᾶται ὅτι οὐκ ἀληθῆ, ἀλλ' ἴσως <ὡς> δεῖ—οἷον καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἔφη αὐτὸς μὲν οἵους δεῖ ποιεῖν, Εὐριπίδην δὲ οἷοι εἰσίν—ταύτῃ λυτέον. εἰ δὲ μηδετέρως, ὅτι οὕτω φασίν).' Then, after some remarks upon the two kinds of faults in poetry, sec. 6 goes on, 'Further, if it be objected that the description is not true to fact, the poet may perhaps reply,—"But the objects are as they ought to be," just as Sophocles said that he drew men as they ought to be; Euripides as they are. In this way the objection may be met. If, however, the representation be of neither kind, the poet may answer,—"This is what is commonly said" (πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἐὰν ἐπιτιμᾶται ὅτι οὐκ ἀληθῆ, ἀλλ' ἴσως <ὡς> δεῖ—οἷον καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἔφη αὐτὸς μὲν οἵους δεῖ ποιεῖν, Εὐριπίδην δὲ οἷοι εἰσίν—ταύτῃ λυτέον. εἰ δὲ μηδετέρως, ὅτι οὕτω φασίν).'

Here it is clear that οὐκ ἀληθῆ and οἷοι εἰσίν refer to οἷα ἦν ἢ ἔστιν in the previous passage, <ὡς> δεῖ and οἵους δεῖ to οἷα εἶναι δεῖ, and οὕτω φασίν to οἷά φασιν καὶ δοκεῖ. I am unable then to see any difficulty in taking οἵους δεῖ in the second passage as equivalent to οἵους εἶναι δεῖ when we have had already οἷα εἶναι δεῖ. Thus far for the grammar. But I also further maintain that to bring out the meaning of Sophocles' saying—the meaning which both Dr. Verrall and Prof. Butcher assign to it—it is *better* to understand εἶναι than δεῖ. It must be noticed that it is not what *Aristotle* says of Sophocles and Euripides, but what *Sophocles* says of himself and Euripides. Aristotle indeed might very well have said that Sophocles 'drew men as they ought to be drawn,' because his views of artistic representation agree with those of Sophocles. But it seems to me that the reply of Sophocles here given amounts to this, 'I do not profess to imitate men as they are found in real life—I leave that to Euripides. I imitate men as they ought to be—ought, that is, according to the canons of art to which I conform.' This is merely saying, I have one theory of art, Euripides another, and appears to my mind to be more pointed as an answer to the objection here propounded, and more consistent with the εὐκολία of Sophocles, than the somewhat arrogant remark, 'I draw men as they ought to be drawn, Euripides as they are.'

R. C. Seaton.

ARISTOPHANES, *FROGS* 1435 *sqq.*

The MSS. give:—

ΔΙ. ἀλλ' ἔτι μίαν γνώμην ἑκάτερος εἴπατον
περὶ τῆς πόλεως ἥντιν' ἔχετον σωτηρίαν.
ΕΥ. εἴ τις πτερώσας Κλεόκριτον Κινησίᾳ 1437
αἴροιεν αὖραι πελαγίαν ὑπὲρ πλάκα.
ΔΙ. γέλοιον ἂν φαίνοιτο· νοῦν δ' ἔχει τίνα;
ΕΥ. εἰ ναυμαχοῖεν, κᾆτ' ἔχοντες ὀξίδας
ῥαίνοιεν ἐς τὰ βλέφαρα τῶν ἐναντίων. 1441
ἐγὼ μὲν οἶδα καὶ θέλω φράζειν. ΔΙ.
λέγε. 1442
ΕΥ. ὅταν τὰ νῦν ἄπιστα πίσθ' ἡγώμεθα, 1443
τὰ δ' ὄντα πίστ' ἄπιστα.

ΔΙ. πῶς; οὐ μανθάνω.
ἀμαθέστερόν πως εἰπὲ καὶ σαφέστερον.
ΕΥ. εἰ τῶν πολιτῶν οἷσι νῦν πιστεύομεν,
τούτοις ἀπιστήσαιμεν, οἷς δ' οὐ χρώμεθα,
τούτοισι χρησαίμεσθ', ἴσως σωθεῖμεν ἄν.
εἰ νῦν γε δυστυχοῦμεν ἐν τούτοισι, πῶς
τἀναντί' ἂν πράξαντες οὐ σῳζοίμεθ' ἄν; 1450
ΔΙ. εὖ γ', ὦ Παλάμηδες, ὦ σοφωτάτη φύσις. 1451
ταυτὶ [πότερ' αὐτὸς ηὗρες ἢ Κηφισοφῶν;

ΕΥ. ἐγὼ μόνος· τὰς δ' ὀξίδας Κηφισοφῶν. 1453
ΔΙ. τί δαὶ σύ; τί λέγεις;

The difficulty of interpreting this passage in any coherent manner has been recognised since the days of Aristarchus. v. 1442 is obviously not tolerable where it stands, and vv. 1451—1453 plainly belong in sense to vv. 1437—1441, and cannot follow vv. 1443—1450. The usual expedient of bracketing or printing in small type is unsatisfactory. The following explanation and arrangement are offered with some confidence.

That there were two editions of this play for two occasions is well known. Is it not therefore self-evident that, when a piece of political advice 'to save the country' was to be offered, that advice would vary in the two editions according to the temporary circumstances, unless it was merely a maxim of general application? The same reference to Cleocritus and Cinesias could hardly suit two distinct occasions in Athenian politics. It is therefore highly probable that we have in the text a clumsy blending of the two editions, and that the whole passage becomes clear if we write it thus—

ΔΙ. εἶπατον
περὶ τῆς πόλεως ἥντιν' ἔχετον σωτήριαν.
ΕΥ. ἐγὼ μὲν οἶδα καὶ θέλω φράζειν. ΔΙ. λέγε. 1442

Then followed—

Edition A (*or B*) *vv.* 1443—1450 (*eight lines*).

ΕΥ. ὅταν τὰ νῦν ἄπιστα...
...σῳζοίμεθ' ἄν;

Edition B (*or A*) *vv.* 1437—1441, 1451—1453 (*eight lines*).

ΕΥ. εἴ τις πτερώσας...
τῶν ἐναντίων.
ΔΙ. εὖ γ', ὦ Παλάμηδες,...
ΕΥ. ...τὰς δ' ὀξίδας κηφισοφῶν.

After which in either edition we proceed with the appeal to Aeschylus

ΔΙ. τί δαὶ σύ; τί λέγεις; etc.

The cause of the disjointed arrangement I take to be that the words ΕΥ. εἴ τις πτερώσας κ.τ.λ.; noted from the first edition, were accidentally inserted before, instead of after, 1442. When the scribe had reached ἐναντίων and should have proceeded with εὖ γ', ὦ, his eye caught instead the similar-looking ἐ γ ὼ of v. 1442, and the remaining three lines (1451—1453) were therefore at first accidentally omitted altogether. Being subsequently found unrepresented, they were written in, but at the wrong place.

[Though I am not sure that the very pronounced *nominativus pendens* of v. 1437 is unsound, I am inclined to suggest that an alteration in v. 1438 of ἄϊροιεν αἶραι to ἀέριον ἄραι would be an easy and not unpleasing way of removing the difficulty. Of course ἄραι rather than the form ἄρειε is appropriate in the mouth of Euripides and in the same line with the 'tragic' πλάκα.]

T. G. Tucker.
University of Melbourne.

NOTES ON CICERO *PRO SESTIO*.

§ 19. Capillo ita horrido ut Capua, in qua ipsa tum imaginis ornandae causa duumviratum gerebat, Seplasiam sublaturus videretur.

'*Sublaturus*' the common explanation 'prohibiturus ne in eo vico unguenta venderentur' seems very strained. It seems to me that the expression, if correct, is to be regarded as very fine sarcasm—he was so careless of his coiffure that you would think he intended to carry off all the barbers' shops, as Verres carried off works of art.

But I cannot help thinking that for '*sublaturus*' we should read '*sublata rus*' or '*rus sublata*' and Seplasia.

'So ungroomed was he that it looked as though all the barbers' shops had been taken from Capua into the country.'

§ 24. quod ita domus fumabat, ut multa eius sermonis indicia redolerent.

The edd. suspect 'sermonis.' I am inclined to think it is right. But 'fumabat' and 'redolerent' must be taken quite literally. 'His kitchen chimney gave many savoury proofs of the philosophical disputation that

he was holding,' *i.e.* nihil esse praestabilius otiosa vita plena et conferta voluptatibus. § 23.

§ 24. id autem foedus meo sanguine ictum sanciri posse.

ictum is suspected.

It is defensible if we translate 'the treaty, if cemented by my blood, could be ratified,' *i.e.* take meo sanguine as instrumental ablative after 'ictum' not after 'sanciri.' This seems the intention of Halm's note.

Cf. *Cic. in Pis.* § 28.

Foedus quod meo sanguine in pactione provinciarum iceras.

§ 30. 'Nihil acerbius socii et Latini ferre soliti quam se ex urbe exire a consulibus juberi.'

Cf. in *Catil.* i. § 13 'Exire ex urbe jubet consul hostem' which expression has distinctly the air of an old political formula.

§ 72. ex iis princeps emitur ab inimicis meis is quem homines in luctu irridentes Gracchum vocabant, quoniam id etiam fatum civitatis fuit, ut illa ex vepreculis extracta nitedula rempublicam conaretur adrodere.

'Gracchum' is, I think, right. Like Gracchus, Numerius attacked the constitution.

But why does Cicero call him a 'nitedula'? Because, say the edd., his name was Rufus, and he was a 'rusticus.' Therefore he is connected with 'mus agrestis rubens.' Possibly there is a joke on the name Quintius which may suggest 'squeaking,' cp. κοΐξειν and the Greek transliteration of Quintius into Κοίντιος. It has been suggested to me in support of this that in the 'Testamentum Porcelli' the name of the pig testator's sister is Quirina. Infra in § 82 it is said of the same Numerius that, learning that he was to be murdered to serve his party's ends, 'messoria se corbe contexit. Cum quaererent alii Numerium alii Quintium gemini nominis errore servatus est.'

It is impossible to take the method of this escape seriously. Like a mouse he hid himself in a corn basket. A reaper's basket cannot really have been big enough to hide a man.

But what is the meaning of 'gemini nominis errore'? Not surely the 'mistake arising from his having two names' but 'the mistake arising from his having two names that fitted into one another.'

They would be calling him in the vocative case Numeri-Quinti. People did not recognize that they were searching for anybody, but thought that they were shouting numbers connected with the distribution of corn. Numerius has hidden himself in a granary. See Forcellini (de Vit) s.v. numerus § 39, who quotes an inscription, late it is true, and adds 'numerus designare videtur vel personam cui data ex ordine tessera illa vel ostio (*sic* ? ostium) unde frumentum accipiebatur.'

§ 72. non ille Serranus ab aratro sed ex deserto† gaviolaeliore† a calatis gaviis in Calatinos Atilios insitus. Read 'ex deserto gaviario,' on which a Greek gloss has been written λαρείῳ. Cicero is again punning on animal names. Gavia = λάρος. To take a parallel from Punch, we might say in English 'Mr. Hogg from the tumble-down piggery.'

'*a calatis Gaviis*' I should like to regard as a gloss of some kind, perhaps 'exoletis Gaviis'—it is certainly not wanted in the text, though it seems feeble to expunge it without a better explanation. Or possibly the gloss may have been 'λάρος a Latinis Gavia.'

§ 131. cum ipsis Nonis Sextilibus idem dies adventus mei fuisset reditusque natalis, idem carissimae filiae, etc., etc. Edd. have obscured this passage by putting the comma after natalis. It should be placed after reditusque.

'The same fifth of August was the day of my arrival, back to Italy, the birthday too of my daughter, the anniversary of the colony of Brundisium, &c., &c.

ERNEST I. ROBSON.

Sydney, March 1897.

MISCELLANEA.

Alcestis 320—322.—In the March number of the *Classical Review* (p. 107) Mr. St. George Stock criticises Professor Earle's treatment of this passage. Mr. Stock himself disposes somewhat summarily of the difficulty by reviving the old explanation, according to which Alcestis is speaking on the *first of the month*, the day on which Death, like other creditors, comes to claim his due. This explanation is seemingly very easy; but in reality it is liable to serious objections, which Mr. Stock appears

to have overlooked. (1) The expression ἐς *τρίτην μηνός*, 'on (or rather "against") the third of the month,' is a very suspicious one. An Attic writer would have said εἰς *τρίτην ἱσταμένου*, or the like. I will not absolutely deny that ἐς *τρίτην μηνός* is a *possible* expression in verse; but *exempla desunt;* and until they are produced the soundness of the text must remain in question. (2) The day on which debts were paid at Athens seems to have been the *last* of the month (ἕνη καὶ νέα) rather than the *first* day of the month (*νουμηνία*). It is true that Plutarch and other late writers mention the payment of debts on the *νουμηνία*: but they wrote at a time when the Roman custom of paying on the Kalends had probably led to a change in the Greek usage. That the ἕνη καὶ νέα was the usual day for settling accounts at Athens is clear from the *Clouds* of Aristophanes, from Lysias *against Pancleon* 6, and other passages too numerous to mention. For these reasons it seems probable that the text is corrupt. Whether Kviçala's emendation, which Professor Earle accepts, is the right one, is another matter.

C.I.A. ii. 3961, 2.—*αὐτὼ δ' οὐ παραδεῖξαι ἀφείλετο δαίμονος αἶσα.* The sense and syntax of this line have not been clear to editors (see for example Kaibel, *Epig. Gr.* 87; Hoffmann, *Sylloge*, 40). I would read, without changing a letter, *αὐτὼ δ' οὐ πάρα δεῖξαι· ἀφείλετο δαίμονος αἶσα*, etc. The construction then becomes perfectly simple.

Horace *Sat.* i. 8, 39.—*Iulius et fragilis Pediatia furque Voranus. Iulius* is clearly wrong, as no member of the Julian family would be mentioned by Horace in this contemptuous way. Read *Tillius*, and compare *Sat.* vi. 107–9. The change from *Iulius* to *Tillius* is palaeographically very easy.

H. W. Hayley.

Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

NOTE ON CICERO *AD ATTICUM*, V. 19. 2.

Filiolam tuam tibi iam † Romae iucundam esse gaudeo, eamque, quam nunquam vidi, tamen et amo et amabilem esse certo scio.

Nearly all editors place this passage beside Att. vii. 2, 4 *Filiola tua te delectari laetor et probari tibi φυσικὴν esse τὴν πρὸς τὰ τέκνα.* Lehmann, accordingly, suggests *amore* or *natura*. Rather we should read *ὁρμῇ* 'by a natural instinct.' In the language of the Stoical philosophy *ὁρμὴ* was the regular word for the natural instincts *cp. Fin.* iv. 39 *Naturalem appetitionem, quam vocant ὁρμήν*: Off. ii. 18 *appetitiones quas illi ὁρμάς* (sc. *nominant*). Written in Roman characters, as the word often is in MSS. (*e.g.* N.D. ii. 58; Fin. iii. 23), it might readily have been corrupted into *Rome*, a mere transposition of letters. Such transpositions are frequent in the Medicean, *e.g.* Att. v. 12. 3, *alterum* for *laterum;* vii. 13. 3, *scripsti* for *scripsit.*

L. C. Purser.

FRONTO AND PLUTARCH.

In the article on Fronto, the tutor of Marcus Aurelius, in Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography, Professor William Ramsay says: 'the story that he was descended by the mother's side from Plutarch is a mere modern fabrication.' These words are apparently taken from a remark of Niebuhr in his edition of Fronto (p. xxv.) that this story 'recentioris aetatis commentum est.' Niebuhr adds 'Auctorem citant Joannem Saresberiensem, sed parum attente lectum; nam Sextum cum Frontone confundunt.' It seems however to have been Niebuhr himself who was guilty of reading John of Salisbury 'parum attente.' He had doubtless observed that a passage, *Policraticus* viii. 19, which mentions Fronto, contained the words 'Institutus est (*sc.* M. Antoninus) ad philosophiam per Apollonium Chalcedonensem, ad scientiam litterarum Graecarum per Chaeronensem Plutarchi nepotem.' The grandson of Plutarch here

meant is of course Sextus; but John proceeds: 'Latinus autem eum Fronto, nobilissimus orator, docuit, *et pro quorundam opinione Plutarchi nepos.*' And above, *Policr.* viii. 13, he says of Seneca: 'eum Fronto, *secundum quosdam nepos Plutarchi*, cujus meminit in primo Juvenalis.' John thus certainly distinguished Fronto from Sextus and made both (but the former doubtfully) the grandsons of Plutarch. What the origin of this report concerning Fronto may have been, I do not know. But it is worth observing that the passage which I have last quoted appears to contain a fragment of Fronto, for after quoting *Juv.* i. 12 John continues thus: 'semper cum (*sc.* Senecam), inquam, sic asserit (*sc.* Fronto) universos exterminare errores, ut aurea videatur saecula reformare, et deos ab humano genere exulantes, ejus opera revocatos, hominibus contractos societate miscere.' Mai (Fronto ed. 1846 p. xxxv.) says 'Fallitur Saresberiensis quod adtinet ad Frontonis cognationem, nam Iuvenalis de antiquiore Frontone loquitur. Reliqua autem quo pacto dicere potuerit S. nisi Frontonem de Seneca scribentem legerit, eruditi dispicient.' Niebuhr supposes Juvenal's Fronto to be one Fronto Catius, mentioned by Pliny; we do not know that he was related to Plutarch; but we have some reason for thinking him to have been related to the tutor of Marcus Aurelius. See Mayor ad Juv. i. 12, and Buttmann's note given in Naber's ed. of Fronto p. 23. In what we have of the later Fronto, he speaks of Seneca only to attack him (ed. Naber pp. 155, 156, 224). See Mai's note, ed. 1846 p. 174.

Mai's references to John of Salisbury are deliberately passed over by Naber; but they deserve more attention than they received. The origin of John's statement, whatever it may be worth, remains unexplained. The curious passages in Appuleius (Metam. i. 12, ii. 3) where his hero's descent from Plutarch is mentioned, should not be forgotten in this connection.

CLEMENT C. J. WEBB.

NOTAE TIRONIANAE ATTRIBUTED TO ST. CYPRIAN.

ALL the writers on this subject refer to an assertion of Trithemius, which is quoted in Hartel's preface to Cyprian p. lxviii., to the effect that he had found a large collection of *notae* bearing the name of Cyprian. This collection has not been seen or heard of since. But in MS. 131 of New College, Oxford, at the end of a large collection of Cyprianic writings, genuine and spurious, there stands a short collection of *notae* headed *quaedam scripturarum note apud celeberrimos auctores fuerunt quasque antiqui ad distinctionem scripturarum carminibus et historiis apposuerunt.* It occupies f. 119*b*—120*b* of the MS., which is of the 15th century and resembles, on the whole, Hartel's *B.* The contents are accurately enough described in the words of Trithemius, *primo characteres sive notae, postea dictiones per eosdem characteres designatae, ita quod dictio quaevis per notam sibi significatur praepositam.* The latest writer who mentions the matter, v. Dobschütz in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1897, column 136, casts doubt on Cyprian's authorship, reasonably enough, and also on the honesty of Trithemius. But a sixteenth century scholar might well be misled by the position of this document at the end of the Cyprianic writings. It is true that the MS. does not assign it to Cyprian, but as much may be said of other writings attributed with more or less probability to him and printed to this day in the editions. So few of the MSS. of Cyprian's epistles have been examined, or at least so few have been described, that somewhere in Germany there may be found one containing the same *notae* in the same place. This would save Trithemius' reputation to some extent. He is not likely to have invented the connection between Cyprian and the *notae;* and yet his assertion would be, at the best, a monstrous exaggeration. I have no knowledge of the subject of *notae Tironianae*, and had no time to examine this collection. It might be worthy of the attention of some student.

E. W. WATSON.

THE GENITIVE Πασιάδᾶϝο.

Professor Allen has kindly communicated to me a suggestion that the Pasiades inscription (cf. May number, p. 190) may after all not be strictly prose, but rather a brief specimen of sepulchral verse like those cited in his *Greek Versification in Inscriptions*, p. 43 infra, with a prose addition by the sculptor. This would explain what had seemed strange to me, namely, the appearance of the uncontracted genitive in the face of the contracted forms of other Doric dialects from the earliest period, and even on some Rhodian inscriptions which it was difficult to date much, if any, later than that of Pasiades. As for the ϝ, though one of the objections to the explanation of Blass would thus be removed, the mere fact of a second occurrence on an inscription of any sort by another individual militates strongly enough against the view of Blass to make another explanation, such as I have given, well worth considering.

Carl D. Buck.

University of Chicago.

MARULLUS'S TEXT OF LUCRETIUS.

The Bibliothèque Nationale contains a copy of the Venice edition of Lucretius, filled with MS. corrections. Some later owner of the book prefixes a note which appears to mean that these readings are due to Pontanus, but students of Lucretius will be interested to know that this volume contains not the text of Pontanus but a very complete copy of the readings of Marullus.

Three hands are apparent in these notes. The first, to which the great bulk of the notes are due, is that of a scholar, with letters finely formed. The second hand has supplemented these largely in the first and second books. Evidently both writers had before them Marullus' readings in manuscript. I think it probable that the additions by the second hand were made after Marullus' death. But the chief interest attaches to the third hand: the strong and decided characters indicate one who was a man of action as well as a scholar. At vi. 357 :—

autumnoque magis stellis fulgentibus apta
concutitur caeli domus,

this writer adds :—

Pe. Monachus ex homeri ε· iliados ἄστερ' ὀπωριν῵ ἐναλίγκιον.

and immediately below he corrects ventique calores thus :—

Puto legendum. Ventique calore.

See Munro here. The writer of this note in the first person was unquestionably Marullus himself. Throughout this volume he has most carefully revised the readings of the first hand, frequently correcting them as well as adding fresh ones, including many which are not mentioned by Munro. The Petrus Monachus who suggested the parallel from Homer, if not the same person, was probably a near relation of the Severus Monacus from whom Pius (editor of the Bologna edition of 1511) borrowed a copy of Marullus' readings; exemplar mira industria castigatum he calls it.

J. Masson.

Paris, *June 10th*, 1897.

POSTGATE'S *SILVA MANILIANA*.

Silva Maniliana. Congessit Joh. P. Postgate. Cantabrigiae, mdcccclxxxxvii. 3*s.* net.

A book like this, which consists almost wholly of particular emendations in the text of Manilius, does not easily admit of any general criticism: but as it will be my business to say most about those emendations which please me least, I will begin by observing that Dr. Postgate's work is as clever

as it is painstaking, and that, while his suggestions are generally bold and sometimes brilliant, he nevertheless displays a proper reverence for manuscript readings in almost every case where such an attitude is consistent with self-respect. For his acquaintance with these readings he is indebted to the as yet unpublished researches of Bechert, except so far as concerns the Madrid manuscript lately made known to the readers of the *Classical Review* by Prof. Robinson Ellis. One could wish that Dr. Postgate had allowed himself to discourse at greater length on the merits of a poet so little known and so well deserving to be known as Manilius, the more so because the remark made by Prof. Ellis (*Noctes Manilianae*, ix.) that the subject is adequately treated by Mr. G. A. Simcox in his *History of Latin Literature*, is scarcely accurate. The astounding statement of Mr. Simcox, that 'it would be unfair to say that the poem is on astrology, for the distinction between astronomy and astrology did not yet exist,' which one would have thought was sufficiently refuted many times over by Manilius himself, is the most striking, but unhappily not the only proof that the learned critic has here ventured upon wholly unfamiliar ground. Dr. Postgate's few remarks on the literary pretensions of Manilius seem to me altogether admirable, except in the choice of passages given in illustration. It is strange that any one should be reminded of Milton by the commonplace lines in which Manilius sings the praises of the Milky Way. The remark that this phenomenon 'resupina facit mortalibus ora,' which so deeply impresses Dr. Postgate, will in others merely induce a feeling of regret that the poet himself should not have been more often thus affected. For Manilius, unlike the blind Milton, was almost wholly unacquainted with the face of the sky. I would also protest against Dr. Postgate's proposal (p. 32) to omit two lines from the fine passage at the beginning of the fourth book. They are certainly in the Manilian manner; and if they are not quite so good as their immediate neighbours, why should they be? On the other hand it would be difficult to sum up some of the poet's characteristics better than Dr. Postgate has done in the words: 'Is est scriptor qui ardua et abstrusa planius et facilius quam communia et in medio jacentia argumenta tractet.' Has not he forgotten his own words when he asks us to transpose lines 426 and 427 of the second book? To me they seem much more Manilian in the old arrangement.

Dr. Postgate begins his inquiry 'de locis spuriis et suspectis' with a somewhat extravagant panegyric on Bentley, invoking Hercules to witness that if that famous scholar had been always at his best in his Manilian lucubrations there would have been little left for any one else to do. Unfortunately, or—seeing how much actually has been left for Dr. Postgate—fortunately, Bentley was as often at his very worst. Sometimes he treated the verses of the unfortunate poet as a careless master might those of an ambitious pupil whose imperfect attempts at utterance he is at no pains to understand, while he labelled lines everywhere as spurious to an extent which even Dr. Postgate allows to be impossible. I do not doubt that, in the Elysian fields, Manilius has long since introduced himself—by his real name—to Huet, or even that, after some delay, he has been persuaded to shake hands with Scaliger. But I cannot believe that he is on speaking terms with Bentley.

Take the passage which Dr. Postgate selects as a proof of Bentley's wisdom—he might fairly, on his theory, have called it infallibility. At II. 232—of Jacob's edition—the line

Parsque marina nitens semper fundentis
Aquari

comes very awkwardly, and though I cannot think, with Dr. Postgate, that it is untranslatable, neither can I hold, with Professor Ellis, that it is necessary to the context. But after IV. 489 some mention of Aquarius undoubtedly is necessary. Thither therefore Bentley transferred the line, changing it 'en route' into 'Pars est prima nocens humentis semper Aquari.' And Dr. Postgate, merely doubting about the substitution of 'humentis' for 'fundentis,' pronounces the rest 'certissima.' Surely this would be hyperbolic even if the line had borne transposition in its original shape.

Here however Bentley is at any rate brilliant. Turn now to p. 5 of Dr. Postgate. The poet, after mentioning the constellation Ara, proceeds:—

Quam propter Cetus convolvens squamea
terga
Orbibus insurgit tortis, et fluctuat alvo.
Intentans morsum, similis jam jamque tenenti,
Qualis ad expositae fatum Cepheidos, &c.
I. 433, *sqq.*

Bentley, with the remark 'Atqui tam

similis est tenenti Andromedam quam qui dimidio coelo ab ea distet,' struck out line 435; but afterwards suggested that it might be allowed to come back, not into the first book, but the fifth, if it would consent to apply, not to the Whale and Andromeda, but to Canis Major and the Hare. And Dr. Postgate, while venturing to deprecate such extreme severity, hastens to observe that Bentley has spoken 'rectissime ad rem.' He has done nothing of the kind. In the first place Andromeda and Cetus are not half, nor a quarter, nor yet an eighth of the sky apart, and they are seen on the meridian at the same time. Secondly, the passage, as Bentley, who refers to Cicero's 'Aratea,' ought to have known, is merely an imitation of what Aratus wrote, not about the Dog, but about the Whale. And thirdly, Dr. Postgate has apparently failed to notice that Bentley, while thus straining at a gnat, has swallowed an enormous camel in accepting the words 'quam propter.' Here is a poet who actually states that the Whale is side by side with the Altar—he probably found the names next to each other in a list of constellations—yet we are not to suppose he could depart so far from the truth as to suggest—he does not say—that the Whale is near to Andromeda.

Turn next to II. 70, *sqq.* (p. 7). ['But for Providential guidance']

Non esset statio terris, non ambitus astris,
Haereretque vagus mundus, standoque rigeret,
Nec sua dispositos servarent sidera cursus,
Noxque alterna diem fugeret rursumque fugaret.

That Dr. Postgate would have failed to understand 71 unless Bentley had said it was meaningless I cannot believe, nor is it easy to suppose that Bentley would have said this, had the line not borne witness against a correction of his own. Bentley took offence, as he well might, at 'sua' in 72, and proposed to substitute 'vaga.' Then, as I conceive, he noticed that 'vagus' occurred in the line before, and therefore struck out that presumptuous line, declaring that only a drunkard or a madman could make 'vagus' an epithet for 'totus mundus.' But why should not the sky—and 'mundus' is the usual Manilian for 'sky'—be called fleeting, as opposed to the stationary earth? Just below, in line 78, we have 'coelum' made 'volare'; besides, if we read with Dr. Postgate, 'erraretque vagus mundus, standove rigeret'—'the sky would wander at random'—we suddenly break the line of thought into which the preceding verse has brought us. The stars would not go round because the sky is not wandering, but sticking fast. Line 72 Dr. Postgate would apparently strike out altogether, observing rather strangely that Bentley's emendation is unnecessarily bold, since '"sua" pro "ejus" positum falsarium arguit.' *If* 'vaga' be the right reading this argument disappears. But it is surely clear that we cannot possibly drop this line altogether, since its 'nec' is absolutely necessary to make sense of the line which follows. Dr. Postgate would make the passage mean, 'But for Providence, night would alternately chase and flee from day.' Surely this is exactly what night, under Providence, does.

It is Bentley again who has led Dr. Postgate (p. 7) to assault the unoffending lines describing the plague of Athens, I. 889–90.

Lassus defecerat ignis,
Et coacervatis ardebant corpora membris.

Here Dr. Postgate alters 'et' to 'nec,' asking with Bentley how the bodies were burnt if the fire had failed. Is not this a little prosaic? To me the lines seem a very natural rendering of the passage in Thuc. II. 52, which says that people whose means of providing funerals were exhausted took to heaping their dead on the pyres provided for those of their neighbours.

In another place (p. 37) Dr. Postgate, again beguiled by Bentley, has certainly gone further wrong than his tempter. At IV. 204, etc. we read

Librantes noctem Chelae cum tempore lucis,
Per nova maturi post annum munera Bacchi,
Mensurae tribuent usus ac pondera rerum.

Bentley was pleased to alter line 205 into 'cum nova maturi gustamus munera Bacchi.' Dr. Postgate displays a good deal of ingenuity in arguing that he should have left it out altogether. 'Quid enim,' he asks, 'ad Libram pertinent ista Bacchi munera?' Well, at III. 662 we read that (cum refulget)

Libra diem noctesque pari cum foedere ducens . . . .
Tum Liber gravida descendit plenus ab ulmo,

and at II. 658–9,

Ver aries, Cererem cancer, Bacchumque ministrans
Libra . . .

The Greek vintage was in fact supposed to be heralded by the heliacal rising of the star ε Virginis, Προτρυγητήρ. I do not suppose that the new wine was tasted immediately, as Bentley has it. But is 'post annum' really so difficult? may it not answer, as Scaliger said, to περιπλομένου ἐνιαυτοῦ.?

On the passage II. 70, *sqq.* above discussed Dr. Postgate truly observes that the presence of 'vagus' and 'vaga' in two consecutive lines is not in itself fatal to Bentley's correction, since 'hujusmodi permulta apud veteres reperiuntur.' This remark somewhat weakens his own objection to the repetition—in a different sense—of 'cum luna' in I. 469, *sqq.* (p. 21)—

Praecipue medio cum luna implebitur orbe
Certa nitent mundo; cum luna conditur omne Stellarum vulgus.

If it be thought impossible that 'cum luna' can mean 'when in company with the moon,' yet a good sense can be easily obtained by placing the semicolon after these words instead of before. Dr. Postgate however conjectures 'tum lunae,' in the sense 'made to disappear by the moon,' a use of the dative which I can find no reason for thinking was as dear to the poet as it is to his latest commentator. We are here bidden to turn to p. 8, where we find the very difficult passage II. 533, *sqq.* thus restored by Dr. Postgate:

Ipse suae parti Centaurus tergore cedit;
Usque adeo est homini victus. Quid mirer ab illis
Nascentis Librae superari posse trigonum?

Here Dr. Postgate has got a dative in every line, whereas the usual reading has 'partis' and 'hominis' certainly genitives, with Librae in any case out of which a sense can be extracted. As the sense even of Dr. Postgate's version perhaps does not lie quite upon the surface, I may observe that the context leaves no doubt of the general meaning, which is that the triangle Aries, Leo, and Sagittarius is less powerful than that of Libra, Aquarius, and Gemini, because in the former two and a half parts out of three are bestial, whereas the latter is wholly human. (This theory is not without some antiquarian interest, seeing that to the earlier Greek writers invariably, and often to Manilius himself, the seventh sign is, not Libra at all, but Chelae, the Claws of the Scorpion.) And Dr. Postgate's translation will be somewhat as follows: 'The Centaur himself [*i.e.* Sagittarius] yields to a part of himself [sc. the human] in virtue of his [equine] back. To this extent is he overcome by man (homine minor est). Why should I wonder that the triangle of him that is born of them (sc. Aries, Leo, and Sagittarius) can be overcome by Libra?' To get the difficult 'nascentis' out of its apparent agreement with 'Librae' is no doubt an advantage. Still it would be easier to believe in the existence of two such datives in two consecutive lines if any of the undisputed Manilian parallels offered by Dr. Postgate came near them in difficulty. But surely the hardest of these, as 'terrae remissi' in I. 759, well rendered by Prof. Ellis 'excused the earth,' are easy by the side of 'homini victus.'

The courage which has here stimulated Dr. Postgate to advocate the reading of two, if not three, well-nigh untranslatable lines running is again conspicuous in his assault (p. 11) on the very mysterious passage, II. 943, *sqq.*—

Haec tua templa ferunt Maia, Cyllenie, nate,
O facies signata nota, quod nomen et ipsi
Auctores tibi dant artis quae ducit Olympum.

This differs practically from the reading of the Gembloux MS. only by the substitution of 'artis' for 'artes,' and of 'quae' for 'qua.' Dr. Postgate admits that, like all other commentators, he has not the least idea what the poet is here talking about. Yet he has made up his mind that the words 'quod nomen—artis' are to be bracketed as a gloss. Bentley pronounced both 944 and 945, because unintelligible to him, an interpolation, on which Dr. Postgate, reminding us that 'cuckoo' is one of Bentley's names for an interpolator, observes quaintly, if not very logically, that in that case the author of the gloss would be a cuckoo which has laid in a cuckoo's nest. But is it quite reasonable to pronounce any part of a sentence to be superfluous before one knows what the rest of the sentence means? Dr. Postgate's attempt at partial explanation is perhaps suggested by a conjecture of Jacob's, that O is not an interjection, but the symbol of Mercury. Against that conjecture it may be urged, first that a word does not become a monosyllable because it is written in shorthand, secondly that, as Letronne fifty years ago maintained, there is no reason to think the planetary symbols are as old as Manilius—I am not sure that Dr. Postgate (p. 58) does not seem to hold a contrary opinion—and thirdly that Jacob, undetected by Professor Ellis, has mistaken the symbol of Venus for

that of Mercury. His suggestion however prepares us in some degree for Dr. Postgate's startling rendering: 'Marked with the letter O, which is the first in the word Olympus.' Brilliant as this is, I confess it does not strike me as convincing, and most people probably will prefer to follow Prof. Ellis in regarding O as an interjection. It is not unknown in this latter sense to the poets.

Having seen how Dr. Postgate can lead a forlorn hope against what may well appear impregnable fortresses, we shall be prepared to behold him next as a conqueror. He is at his very best in his treatment of the long passage (III. 590–617) which explains how much life is promised to a child by the position of the moon in this or that of the celestial 'houses' at the time of birth. In the lines as usually read a certain principle of order is discernible, the more fortunate houses promising longer lives than the less; but there are some strange intervals and at least one obvious exception. As amended by Dr. Postgate (p. 30, &c.) the passage loses its difficulty, and displays a coherence and regularity worthy a better subject. The alterations by which this happy result is achieved are few and beautifully simple. The most striking of them, which replaces 'mensibus' by 'messibus'—so many harvests in the sense of so many years—is suggested by a passage in Martial (VI. 28, 8) which, curiously enough, also supplies Dr. Postgate with an unexpected confirmation of another reading in the same lines. We get also a final settlement of the question whether he who 'ter vicenos geminat, tres abstrahit annos' makes 117 or 57, as to which, by the way, Dr. Postgate is mistaken in saying that Scaliger got the wrong answer.

I would now ask whether, if we admit the probability that Manilius here ought to have written what Dr. Postgate sets before us, we should also draw the inference that he did so write. I myself think we should, because the poet, who loved figures as few poets have loved them, would have had in this case only a row of figures to copy. The case would be very different were astrological doctrine in question. We see that Manilius not only made grievous blunders in his astronomy, but sometimes endeavoured to follow two incompatible systems at once; and if we knew more of pre-Manilian astrology, we should probably find, as M. Lanson has so well urged, that he was here just as often in error. When therefore Dr. Postgate (p. 35) proposes a trifling correction 'ne secum pugnet Manilius,' the plea seems to me inadequate. And for this reason, among others, I strongly dissent from his plausible interpretation (p. 29) of the difficult passage III. 545, *sqq.*

It is here laid down that the first year, month, day, and hour of a man's life are influenced by the sign rising at the moment of birth, the succeeding years, months, days, and hours by the succeeding signs in order. Hence in later life a great—perhaps convenient—confusion of influences, as the shorter seasons run through the signs so much faster than the longer:

> Venit omnis ad astrum
> Hora die bis, mense dies semel, unus in anno,
> Mensis, et exactis bis sex jam solibus annus.

Thus the passage is generally written, and thus written it can, as Huet showed, be interpreted easily enough after a fashion. As to the two last clauses there is no difficulty, and never would have been any had not Bentley inserted a perfectly imbecile correction which every one has disregarded. The first clauses, says Huet, signify that every hour comes twice a day to the sign, because in every twenty-four hours the same hour occurs twice, once by day and once by night. But the day only comes to it once a month, because no day in a month is ever repeated, It is clear that this facile solution satisfies only the letter. We want to know what day of our life it is, not what day in a particular month, and though the first day of a month does not recur, yet the thirteenth and twenty-fifth days of that month will be under the same sign as the first: in fact, the sign goes round among the days of the month, not once, but three times, or twice at the least. Dr. Postgate's proposal is that of Dufay, to place the comma, not after 'semel,' but before, making 'bis' refer alike to hour and day. 'Nam cum XII signa sint, bis (ut duce Manilio numerum ponam, partes neglegam) singulis mensibus ad idem reditur astrum.' Here however I would remind him of his own admirable remark that 'in arithmeticis subtiles atque intricatas rationes nemo magis luculenter versibus exponit' than Manilius, whose metrical numbers in fact never flow more smoothly than when he has arithmetical numbers to express. That a poet who (I. 547) did not allow himself so much poetical license as to say that the circumference of a circle is just three times the diameter, would condescend to say 'twice' when the truth lies nearer to thrice, I cannot

believe. Nor do I think that his words can fairly be made to bear such a meaning. 'Venit omnis ad astrum hora, &c.' can only signify 'every hour comes twice a day to the sign.' This no doubt is much the same thing as to say that every sign comes twice to an hour. But though it might be true to say that every sign comes twice—or thrice—a month to a day, it is not equally true to say that every day comes twice or thrice to a sign. Yet this is really what Dr. Postgate makes Manilius say. I think therefore that Huet has rightly interpreted the poet's meaning, however unsatisfactory it may be. How much blame should rest on him and how much on his authorities it would be hard to decide; but he has himself supplied evidence that ancient astrologers were not always careful to be mathematically correct. About this doctrine, however, he cannot have cared much, as he has, a few lines before, mentioned with apparent approval another quite inconsistent with it; and it is possible he did not know much. Where and when was it invented? With the aid of the Julian calendar the calculations required by it are made easily enough. But to Greeks and Babylonians, who kept their months by the moon, there were not always twelve months in the year; to Egyptians, who broke the sequence of months each year by the intercalation of five days which belonged to no month, it is hard to see how it can have commended itself. Probably Manilius was here, as in many other places, out of his depth.

Having said so much about the transposition of a comma, I will devote the rest of my remarks to passages in which the question is at any rate of words. At IV. 817, *sqq.* (pp. 42–44) is a long disquisition on what Manilius calls 'ecliptica signa,' those, that is, in which for the time being lunar eclipses take place, and which consequently themselves lose their vigour. It may be considered an astrological statement of the facts that the moon's nodes move from east to west, and that when the ascending node is in any sign the descending will be in the opposite. Lines 848, 849, according to the Gembloux manuscript, run as follows:

Ipsa docent titulos causae quae ecliptica signa
Dixere antiqui, pariter sed bina laborant.

Something of course must be done to 848. Bentley did it easily by leaving out 'quae'; but as Prof. Ellis observes, the word can hardly have got into many MSS. without reason. Dr. Postgate would take the bold course of leaving out still more, and reading

Ipsa docent tituli causas; sed bina laborant.

It is true that, as he says, the words 'quae ecliptica' &c. only repeat what has been said before, but it was a great many lines before, and supposing them to be merely a gloss, it is hard to see why 'pariter' should also have been repeated from quite another part of the passage. Moreover it seems to me that something to explain 'tituli' is required at this point. Would it not be possible to make 'ipsa' nominative to 'lugent' in the line before, and borrowing a hint from Prof. Ellis read the passage:

Et velut elatam Phoeben in funere lugent
Ipsa (docet titulus causas) quae ecliptica &c.?

A little further on, it seems to me that Dr. Postgate, or his predecessors, create a difficulty. Manilius goes on to say, 860, *sqq.*

Tum vicina labant ipsis haerentia signis
Quae prius in terras veniunt terrasque relinquunt,
Sidereo non ut pugnet contrarius orbi,
Sed qua mundus agit cursus inclinat et ipse, &c.

Dr. Postgate insists that one or more lines must have been lost after 861, as otherwise what follows is without meaning. He allows that, even if we do not read 'orbis' in 862, the word must be understood in agreement to 'contrarius.' If so, I cannot see wherein the difficulty lies. The next to fail are the pair of signs immediately to the west, says Manilius, 'not in such a way that the revolution (sc. of the nodes) should be contrary to that of the (fixed) stars; but as the heaven directs its course, so it too inclines' &c. I am aware that Scaliger, and apparently Pingré, understand 'orbis' to mean the earth; and possibly Dr. Postgate does so too. But if so, these lines and those that follow seem to me to have absolutely no meaning at all.

Another gap is suspected by Dr. Postgate, p. 49, in that part of the fifth book, so interesting from a literary and so outrageous from an astronomical point of view, where Manilius discusses the powers of the constellations which rise with successive degrees of the ecliptic. The common reading—V. 338—attributes certain effects to

Lyra, quae cornua ducet ad astra
Chelarum surget cum pars vicesima sexta.

After which we go on to stars that rise with the Scorpion. Dr. Postgate, reading 'ducit,' places a full stop after 'astra,' and supposes that after 339 many lines have been lost in which the influences of some star rising with the 26th degree of Libra were given. His remark that the poet has undertaken in this fifth book to tell us several things of which we hear no more, though true, is not conclusive, since Manilius, whose work as a treatise on astrology is manifestly incomplete, has made other unfulfilled promises. The whole passage however is chaotic, and line 340, which should mention the Scorpion, does so only in virtue of a restoration by Scaliger, which, though displaying, as Jacob says, a divine ingenuity, is after all the work of a mortal. But I cannot think that Dr. Postgate has hit on the right solution. In the first place, it is hard to believe that the abrupt and superfluous phrase, 'quae cornua ducit ad astra,' can be the end of a sentence, especially as the reading of the best MSS. is 'ducet,' the future tense obviously demanding some continuation. Secondly, this part of Book V. cannot be fully discussed without some reference to the similar passages in the eighth book of Firmicus. That this fourth-century writer here copied Manilius has often been supposed, and Prof. Ellis—*Noct. Manil.* 225, *sqq.*—seems to consider it certain, though, if so, Firmicus, as it appears to me, got at least twice very near a deliberate falsehood. Now if we compare the two writers, one thing, I think, is clear, that Firmicus, if Manilius was the source of his information, had before him more of Manilius than has come down to us. And therefore, if there is such a gap in Manilius as Dr. Postgate here supposes, we might reasonably hope to find it filled up in Firmicus. But Firmicus has no star rising with the 26th degree of Libra.

As however Dr. Postgate has written a short appendix to say what, in his opinion, that star should be, I should like to urge, in a still shorter one, that Manilius be held innocent until he is proved guilty. That the man who made the Hyades rise with the 27th degree of Aries was capable of anything, must be admitted: still without evidence we have no right to suspect that he made Antares rise with the 26th degree of Libra. The star was in his time almost at the middle of the sign Scorpio, and is several degrees south of the ecliptic.

Dr. Postgate however has, in other respects, deserved well of Manilius, whom he treats throughout, not merely as a fellow-creature, but as one who, with all his faults, was much more richly endowed than most of us. What could be simpler and cleverer than his corrections of 'Nave agit' for 'navigat' in IV. 173, or 'genius' for 'censum' in II. 889? I cannot myself feel strongly convinced by Dr. Postgate's learned arguments—pp. 46–48, &c.—to prove that our poet was greatly influenced by Propertius; but were it established it would be a pleasant addition to our knowledge, or rather illumination of our ignorance, concerning the man we call Manilius—Prof. Ellis has done all that can be done towards proving that he called himself so.

E. J. Webb.

HOGARTH'S *PHILIP AND ALEXANDER OF MACEDON.*

Philip and Alexander of Macedon. By D. G. Hogarth. With maps and illustrations. Pp. 1–305. Price 14*s.* Murray.

Nothing is more difficult than to reconstitute satisfactorily the character or the unaverred plans of the great men of antiquity. The facts may be pretty well established; the dates may be in process of continual correction; the minds of the men never become any better known, or, if a modern enquirer does happen really to think their thoughts, he can seldom prove his ideas to himself, and still less often can he do so to others. We know how hard it is to be sure what our own friends are thinking or even doing; harder still is it to enter into the minds of living statesmen; hardest it is and always must be to be sure about statesmen dead and divided from us by a gulf which looks deeper and deeper the longer we gaze into it. Our ability to see something which, if not true, is at least possible, reasonable, and consistent, is greatest when we have letters of the great men or Plutarch's more or less sympathetic biographies. But ancient letters, not very often forthcoming at all, are rarely so well guaranteed as Cicero's, and even the heroes of Plutarch are often the subject of bitter modern dispute as to their

character and plans. In the case of Alexander of Macedon there is a fairly full biography to go upon; Arrian, Quintus Curtius, Justin, and Diodoros give us connected facts; and Mr. Hogarth follows Pridik in accepting certain letters as at least partly genuine. But even about Alexander, Grote and Niebuhr differed strangely from Droysen and Freeman. The tolerably favourable view of the great conqueror which Holm takes in his recent *Griechische Geschichte* (now in process of being translated into English) and the rather brief and dogmatic account of him and his works in B. Niese's *Gesch. d. griechischen und makedonischen Staaten* do not disguise the existence of serious differences of opinion among modern historians on fundamental points and of important difficulties in the recorded evidence. About Philip II., on the other hand, the evidence at our command, while it is singularly fragmentary and hostile, does not give us authentic papers, or enough of them to reveal anything of the king's mind, and does not include the judgment of anyone whose opinion we can, after weighing his date and circumstances, value at all highly. Perhaps it is for this reason that Philip 'supplies the central figure to no extant biography.'

Mr. Hogarth, then, has set himself a task of no small difficulty in reconstructing the character and views of both men, and, oddly enough, he has succeeded best with the more difficult half. His Alexander somehow does not appear so real and so alive as his Philip. Yet the living reality of his Philip, we must not forget, is gained by taking a free hand in dealing with him. This is no blame to Mr. Hogarth. Whoever writes of Philip needs must, if he means to be read, take a free hand and insert a great deal of matter of his own finding. The evidence about this king is so deficient and in such a state that it can only be eked out and made coherent by boldly laying down what we *think* is the probable view of his character. The writer must reconstitute that character confidently, though with insufficient means, or he must leave Philip an incomprehensible and not very interesting person,—not personality. Mr. Hogarth has the courage required, and he often carries us with him in what he assumes. We are not indeed sure about the following judgment:—

'The width of his [Philip's] sympathies, coupled with a radical insincerity of character, enabled him to adapt himself to all things and all men—to talk with Aristotle, or to drink to excess of good fellowship with boors and bravos.'

If we know anything at all about Philip, we know that he could drink hard,—and a good thing too for a man in his position,—but the 'radical insincerity' of character is not so certain. Radically insincere men are generally found out and do not achieve great results. The king's plans however and their gradual growth can hardly be more plausibly conceived and set forth than by Mr. Hogarth. Studies in modern history and observations of modern times have helped him, we suspect, hardly less than reading of ancient authorities; but this only means the importation into the writing of history of a practical element which it has too often wanted: and his interpretation of Philip's ideas gains liveliness and probability by notions which he has probably drawn from watching Italy and the modern history of the Balkan Peninsula.

'Few men have seen so surely as Philip the faults of a dying order, and set themselves so consciously to create a new.' The day of city states was over. The time and the opportunity had come for a nation; and, if a nation has not grown up insensibly and come into being unobserved, the best or perhaps the only way to extemporize national feeling is through an army. Common service creates a common flag, a common feeling, a common king, and even a common language. There was a good fighting nucleus in the oldest Macedonia; there was good stuff among her dependencies, if only it could be induced to fight for and not against the suzerain; great prizes might reward the military effort forthwith and great results must follow later if a national Macedonian army could be created and used. Subsidiary to this effort must be the development of improvements in weapons, tactics, and strategy. Kill and make room to grow; grow together and grow outward. This comprises the essence of Philip's measures. How far forward the king saw, how many present prizes and future results he reckoned on at the outset it would be rash to say. He must have been less clever than we think him if he could not extend his ideas when his first successes were won and his means increased.

'Philip's claim to rank among great creative statesmen is not that he foreknew all the ultimate results of his action, but that he seized in their inception and directed successive developments. Both his ideal, and his knowledge of the means to attain it, grew with the growth of events. If in 358 it did not rise above the consolidation of the military strength of Macedonia, and chance in the main made him the creator of Macedonian political unity, it is very certain that he had come to be possessed by a

clear conception even of the unification of all Hellas, when he spent his last two years in enlisting the Greeks for common service with Macedonians in a great war.'

Here Mr. Hogarth has the advantage of Holm in plausibility. Holm carries back the schemes for unifying Hellas and conquering Asia almost to the beginning of Philip's reign; but it is improbable that a prince whose position was small and also uncertain could aspire to so much. *L'appétit vient en mangeant.*

Mr. Hogarth is no less convincing when he comes to touch on the limitations of Philip's genius:—

'He was in some respects not a great man of civil affairs. To the bitter end he understood but very imperfectly the arts of peace. He could conquer, but usually he was embarrassed by his conquest. Often in the record of his life we have to note that his work must be done twice, even thrice over. Thessaly, for example, was organized into due subjection only after years of desultory fighting and intriguing; in Euboea Philip never wholly succeeded at all. There is a certain crude and tentative character about his dealings with the Greeks, and with Athens especially, which his son never would have displayed, never indeed did display. Those all powerful bonds of trade, that astute balancing of nationalities, that subtle use of religious influences, which made every province that Alexander left behind him as much his as if he had spent all his life in organizing it alone,—these things were hardly dreamed of by his father.'

To historians who ascribe to Philip anything like the above choice of ends and means the Macedonian army must needs be deeply interesting, and Mr. Hogarth describes its material and its arrangements, if briefly, yet clearly and well: but he perhaps underestimates the military importance of sea affairs in the times of Philip and his son.

'Although it might be irksome to Philip not to have the command of the Aegean, that disability was not more fatal to him than it proved two centuries later to Rome. His was a land power resting on a continental basis, and, in the main, independent of sea-going trade: and, even had Athens not had rivals on her own element, such as Rhodes, Chios, Byzantium, and Syracuse, the geographical position of Philip's realm would have placed him beyond the reach of anything but irritation from her admirals.'

Students of Captain Mahan's writings will hardly be satisfied with these sentences.

But now, taking for granted Philip's ability in the choice of means, does he deserve the bitter censure which has often been passed on him for destroying Greek liberty and thereby doing a wrong to civilization? Not in the least, Mr. Hogarth argues. The Hellas of small states had played its part; it could only do further good work in the world by being compelled into some kind of union and also by being forced out of its own bounds,—out of Europe into Asia and Africa. These two wholesome things Philip undertook to do for Hellas, and we must not so sympathize with the patient as to abhor the operation. Athens, in particular, had ceased to be vigorous in Philip's day, and could hold out no further promise to mankind. (Her decadence is well traced by Mr. Hogarth, though he does not make as much as we should of the effects of the great plague. Plutarch, *Per.* 36, says ἀπέβαλεν ὁ Περικλῆς τότε τῶν φίλων τοὺς πλείστους καὶ χρησιμωτάτους πρὸς τὴν πολιτείαν, and their place was filled by inferior men, both as leaders and as led. A small city state may receive from chance visitations such injuries to population, in kind and purity, if not in numbers, as can seldom befall a nation.) Hence it is a mistake, though a natural one, 'a grave error in historical perspective, to represent Philip as engaged consciously during all his reign in a great duel with Demosthenes.' That orator was not so important at Athens, and Athens was not then so important in the world. But no reader of Mr. Hogarth's is likely to fall into this error.

One other useful correction he supplies to Demosthenes' speeches. Philip's fortification of Elatea has been misrepresented and misunderstood. It was only

'The reasonable precaution of a prudent general. If it menaced any city, that city was Thebes. The site of Elatea lies more than sixty miles by any practicable road from the nearest point of the Attic frontier, and at least ninety from Athens. The whole Copaic plain, the Theban territory, and the range of Cithaeron intervene. There was absolutely no ground, except Demosthenes' unsupported word, for the belief that Philip was entrenching Elatea as a menace to Athens.'

We have implied above that Alexander is harder to understand than Philip: but this may only mean that Alexander was a man so much above the line and out of comparison with others (either in his genius or his destiny,—we need not decide now) that we cannot easily range him or find the type to which he belongs. Though we are better informed too about the son than the father, we do not know nearly enough to fix our opinions. No one can deny to Alexander military genius of the highest order; but, as to the rest, sometimes we are disposed to credit him with penetrating and far-reaching designs, conceived in the interests of civilization; sometimes we feel that a man so wanting in self-restraint and so

capable of wild acts cannot have had brain enough for all that is ascribed to him, and we suspect that, if the happy consequences of Alexander's conquests and arrangements were really conceived beforehand in the mind of anybody, it was in the mind of someone who stood behind the throne,—perhaps Ptolemy. But here Mr. Hogarth will quarrel with our premisses. He seems to deny that the king was wanting in self-restraint, and will not hear of his being really mad at any time. We should not like to say that Alexander was ever really mad; but the borderland of insanity is wide, and Mr. Hogarth is not far from our idea when he writes that the conqueror's fortune 'will raise him ever higher and higher on his pinnacle of isolation, until his nerves begin to crack and his head to swim.' Mr. E. Gardner remarks with truth (in his useful *Handbook of Greek Sculpture*, p. 435) that 'Literature has not done Alexander justice.' Why? Chiefly because there is not enough of it, and we have to puzzle the man out as best we may. What is it likely that he designed, if we look at (*a*) the recorded facts and (*b*) his character? But unhappily the character has to be made out chiefly from the facts. A portrait-bust of the king in the British Museum, as interpreted by Mr. Hogarth, vouches for Alexander's 'inordinate pride of self' and for a nature 'neither cold nor passionless': but should we read all this in the bust if it were a nameless one? 'No man not essentially emotional would risk so much for ideas.' But how do we know what ideas he had? Modern historians who are favourable to him have built up praiseworthy ideas for him, or have slipped them as a foundation under the undoubted record of his acts; but how little of the foundation is itself solid! Alexander certainly meant to make conquests, but what he meant to do with them, (if he meant anything) his early death among other things prevents us from knowing.

At all events Mr. Hogarth does not commit the mistake of giving Alexander only one plan and only one state of character. He sees that the plans *must* have changed with the openings, and that it is very likely that the character of a young man who never knew disaster and who was almost or quite worshipped in his lifetime altered for the worse. He points out the probable stages and causes of change, and traces the development of the King of Macedon and Captain General of Hellas into the Emperor of Europe and Asia. He no doubt hits the truth in saying that Alexander designed even at starting the complete conquest of the Persian empire, and that it is needless to find special reasons for his taking this or that step forward. Such reasons may be in place in considering the growth of the Roman or the British empire; they are not wanted to explain the advance of great Oriental conquerors or of Alexander of Macedon.

On Alexander's measures as an organizer after conquest we have already quoted something. The founder of Alexandria

> 'Was indeed familiar with economic questions, and had a vivid interest and belief in the influence of commerce. His instructions to Nearchus before he left the Indus, his removal of the obstructions in the Tigris water-way, his proposal to create a second Phoenicia on the shore of the Persian Gulf—these are instances of a single-minded commercial purpose, which conditioned also, but less directly, many other enterprises.'

Under this head, or at least under the head of peaceful reorganization, might have been mentioned Alexander's new arrangement of the relations of the town and temple of Ephesus, designed in the interest of good police. One or two of Mr. Hogarth's estimates of men have quite the Mommsen ring about them, as for instance when he speaks of 'respectable corporals like Phocion.' His style is fresh and vigorous, but we note a frequent employment of modern geographical names. Things happen with him near Volo, in Roumelia, or in the Vardar plain. The map of the area of Alexander's Asiatic conquests is filled up with few but modern names. We have thought twice before speaking of this, in deference to Mr. Hogarth's double position as traveller and historian, but we find ourselves after all unable to see what end is served by the practice. If the representatives of the Macedonian colonies 'survive still as ganglia in Asia's nerve-system of caravan roads,' both the ancient and the modern name might be given, but to give the modern name alone is scarcely lucid enough. To speak also of a *race* as Aryan is not to use the best method of expression.

Mr. Hogarth is too modest in calling his book 'Two Essays in Biography.' It is more than that. He has compressed into a volume of moderate size really all that there is to know about two great kings. It is a good thing to have a modern book, and a thorough book, which is not bulky or cumbrous. The author has succeeded in keeping the size of his work down by not being afraid to speak straight out and by boldly

passing over many bewildering intrigues in which no one can see clear, while he relegates what he has to say of the uncertain chronology to a final note where it can all be taken together. On the whole we feel on looking back on the book that a page of history gains in life and interest by being treated in the form of biography. As history must be read, if it is to be written, this perhaps outweighs one drawback which generally attends biography, namely the omission of some subjects akin to the life told, but not near enough to the man himself for insertion. We should have liked to hear Mr. Hogarth's estimate of the remoter consequences of the Macedonian conquests, — a subject on which Finlay touched, but not exhaustively,—and to see the reaction of the East upon Greece analysed. The points in organization and usage which the Macedonian rulers, like the Romans after them, took over from the subject East are a curious study. Why, for instance, was the eagle so honoured by Alexander? It was revered in the East before him, but only as one among other sacred animals. Neglecting others, he attached the idea of the eagle closely to himself, and it was finally taken up into the Alexander legend, playing a part which not even the ram or the serpent equals.

The illustrations to Mr. Hogarth's book (chiefly from medallions and portrait-busts) deserve a word of praise. The frontispiece, Alexander in Battle, from the Sarcophagus of the Satraps, now at Constantinople, is not only very beautiful but also new to most English readers.

FRANKLIN T. RICHARDS.

BLASS'S EDITION OF THE ACTS.

Acta Apostolorum. Editio philologica apparatu critico, commentario perpetuo, indice verborum illustrata auctore FRIDERICO BLASS. Götingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 1895. Pp. 334. 12 mk.

Acta Apostolorum secundum formam quae videtur Romanam, edidit FRIDERICUS BLASS. Leipsic: B. S. Teubner. 1896. Pp. 96.

A COMMENTARY on the Acts from so distinguished a scholar as Dr. Blass is sure to deserve and receive much attention, and it may be said at once that the notes, in which no attempt is made to discuss dogmatic questions, are for the most part models of terse, clear and scholarly exegesis. For example on 11, 26 it would be difficult to have a better note than this:—

'Χρηστιανοί ex ℵ utique recipiendum. Nempe a Graecis id nomen inditum, cum Ναζωραίους vocarent Iudaei, 24, 5; Graeci autem nomen Χριστός, quod ignotum sibi et sine intellectu esset, in Χρηστός nomen haud inusitatum (exstat terdeciens in C. I. Att. vol. iii.) facillima ratione mutaverunt, qui est mos vulgi omnibus aetatibus. Inde Χρηστιανοί ut Ἡρῳδιανοί (Mt. 22, 16), Καρποκρατιανοί, Σιμωνιανοί al., Ἀττικιανὰ (ἀντίγραφα) ab Ἀττικός, formatione et Romanis et Graecis illo aevo usitata. Cf. Tertull. Apol. 3: *sed et tum cum perperam Chrestianus pronuniatur a vobis* (*nam nec nominis certa est notitia apud vos*), *de suavitate vel benignitate compositum est.* Lactant. i. div. i. 4: *exponenda hujus nominis* (*Christus*) *ratio est propter ignorantiam eorum, qui eum immutata litera Chrestum solent dicere.*' Or again 20, 28 in the vexed passage ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἣν περιεποίησατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου, where Dr. Blass rightly reads with most MSS. τοῦ κυρίου, he wisely dismisses the whole controversy in a brief phrase of sound sense—'solita confusio inter κύριος et θεός (etiam v. 32), alias innocua, hic magnas turbas dedit, quia διὰ τ. αἵμ. τ. ἰδ ad θεοῦ referendum,' and he points out (Prol. p. 36) that the change would readily be made in an age when 'moris factum erat ut θεός Iesus diceretur,' while he might have added that the phrase ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ occurs eleven times in St. Paul's epistles so that it would be readily substituted for ἐκκ. τοῦ κυρίου which is unique in N.T. If indeed any fault is to be found with the exegesis it is that it deals too much with single words or phrases and neglects the sometimes obscure connection of thought. For instance in the very difficult speech of Peter 10, 34–39 the sequence of thought is by no means made clear, though the brilliant suggestion to omit κύριος in the phrase οὗτός ἐστι πάντων κύριος (a hopeless riddle in our English Bible), and so render 'the message which he sent . . . through Jesus Christ, that (message) is for all men' deserves the most care-

ful consideration. The equally difficult speech of Peter 1, 16–22 is also left without any clear explanation, and in 8, 33 one would like something better on ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει αὐτοῦ ἡ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ἤρθη than 'sensu fere cassa; aliter Hebr. Non facile perspicitur qua ratione ducas intellexerit.' The ἆρά γε γινώσκεις ἃ ἀναγινώσκεις; of Philip is certainly not answered by such a note.

It is not, however, in the exegetical notes that the special interest of this edition lies. It is well known that the codex Bezae presents, especially in the Acts, a very great number of variants from the readings of most MSS., and these variants are supported by the Syriac version ('versio N.T. syriaca, dicta Philoxeniana a Philoxeno episcopo Hierapolitano, qui per Polycarpum choriepiscopum eam faciendam curavit, finita a. 508; eadem uno fere saeculo post per Thomam Charklensem, Mabugi episcopum, Alexandriae degentem, denuo cum codicibus graecis comparata atque ex eis aucta est, eaque Thomae additamenta cognationem versionis cum D effecerunt;' p. 25), and also, among others, by 'codex latinus palimpsestus, regius dictus apud Tischendorfium, quia in bibliotheca Parisiensi olim regia asservatur, iam autem Floriacensis dicendus, postquam patefactum est monasterii Floriacensis (*Fleury*) olim eum fuisse' (p. 27) which is also in striking harmony with Cyprian's quotations from the Acts ('ita concinere F cum Cypriano Carthaginiensi episcopo, ubi is locos ex Actis affert, ut videamus habuisse Cyprianum eandem fere hanc Actorum versionem,' p. 27). This text, which seems to have held its ground chiefly in the west, Dr. Blass marks β, while the ordinary text, which prevailed in the east, he marks α. In his apparatus criticus he very lucidly prints the readings of the α sources separately above the readings of the β sources, and he has also printed what he considers the correct β text independently in a separate volume. The theory which he holds is one 'quam dudum invenit Ioannes Clericus: bis Lucam sua edidisse,' and, after referring to the description given in Catullus xxii. of Suffenus, who was not content to keep his poems 'sic ut fiat in palimpseston relata,' he thus proceeds in words which it would be unfair to abridge:

'Itaque ei qui versus pangebant eos in charta vili primum scribere solebant, ut etiam delere aut mutare possent quae sibi postea minus placerent; itidem Lucam fecisse crediderim, Theophilo autem librum non in palimpsesto scriptum misisse, sed in charta, etsi non regia, tamen paullo meliore. Possum commemorare etiam Aristotelis librum περὶ πολιτείας Ἀθηναίων nuper repertum; est exemplar ad usum privatum scriptum in aversa charta, cum adversa iam pridem esset aliis scripturis oppleta; fuerit huius simile prius exemplar Lucae, sed ad Theophilum tale non erat mittendum. Iam fac prius illud, quod manserat apud auctorem, ab aliis esse descriptum: habebis originem duarum recensionum minime certam, sed haud improbabilem' (p. 32).

Against the ordinary theory that β is a recension of α made by another and later hand, Dr. Blass says: 'Nego potuisse quemquam, qui a rebus illis alienus esset, addere quae non paucis locis in β ex intima rerum cognitione addita sunt: velut Mnasonem, apud quem deverterunt Paulus comitesque (21, 16), in vico habitasse inter Caesaream et Hierosolyma cito, vel promisisse Dominum usque ad Pentecosten se spiritum sanctum eis missurum esse, non ipso eo die (1, 5 cf. 2, 1) vel...,' and he then proceeds: 'Sed fac potuerit aliquis quod profecto non potuit: nego voluisse Acta ita refingere ut esse in β videmus. Non perspicua magis narratio reddenda erat, nisi paucis locis, brevior fortasse reddi poterat, sed ille reddidit etiam prolixiorem, non elegantiam sectatus est, non mutavit sententias; cur igitur omnino quicquam mutavit?' so that as no one *could* or *would* have executed such a recension we are reduced to referring it to Luke himself, 'ei nempe neque facultas deesse poterat neque voluntas,' since any one who writes out a composition twice is sure to emend and above all omit what seems superfluous, this latter point proving that β cannot come from α because it is fuller and longer.

Now it is obvious at once that this theory of his work having been first written by Luke on the back of some other MS. and then copied and emended by him for despatch to his distinguished friend Theophilus, while the original autograph was treasured and preserved in the Roman church, is a theory which is very gratifying to the imagination but which needs very strong evidence before it can be accepted as having reasonable claim to represent actual fact. Examined in that light the evidence is (I) inadequate and (II) points to an opposite conclusion.

I. Taking first the evidence which according to Dr. Blass compels us to refer the β text to Luke himself, it is impossible, of course, to deal with all the passages he refers to, though they are not very numerous, but the two passages quoted above, which he

himself puts in the fore-front of his argument, may fairly be taken as test passages and deserve to be examined.

In 21, 16 we have

(α) *συνῆλθον δὲ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν ἀπὸ Καισαρείας σὺν ἡμῖν, ἄγοντες παρ' ᾧ ξενισθῶμεν Μνάσωνί τινι Κυπρίῳ, ἀρχαίῳ μαθητῇ· γενομένων δὲ ἡμῶν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα...*

(β)*...σὺν ἡμῖν, οὗτοι δὲ ἤγαγον ἡμᾶς πρὸς οὓς ξενισθῶμεν, καὶ παραγένομενοι εἴς τινα κώμην ἐγενόμεθα παρὰ Μν. Κ. μαθ. ἀρχ. κἀκεῖθεν ἐξίοντες ἤλθομεν εἰς Ι.*

Here the note is—'Multo autem disertius in β, unde id quoque elucet, in vico aliquo inter Caes. et Hier. Mnasonem habitavisse. Neque enim unius diei erat iter cum esset milium p. lxviii....et ex more scriptoris indicandum erat, ubi pernoctavissent.' The phrase 'multo disertius in β' shall be noticed presently, but we ask at once what is the proof that a corrector could not or would not have made the alterations. There is absolutely none, and the passage is one which almost suggests correction. Firstly the words *ἄγοντες παρ' ᾧ ξενισθῶμεν Μνάσωνι*, are as Dr. Blass himself notes ('concise et subobscure pro *πρὸς Μν. ἵνα ξενισθ. παρ' αὐτῷ*') not clear and invite elucidation; secondly the phrase 'conducting us to the house of Mnason,' supposing that Mnason lived in Jerusalem, seems to anticipate Paul's arrival there and to make the phrase 'but when we came to Jerusalem' appear awkward, although it is as natural as the famous 'and so we came to Rome' of 28, 14, where Dr. Blass boldly writes '*ἠλθαμεν*, melius erat *ἐπορεύομεθα* quia finis itineris v. 16 demum commemoratur'; and, thirdly, the remark that they stayed the night at 'a certain village' is exactly one which would be made by a corrector, *because* the fact of the journey from Caesarea to Jerusalem involving a halt for the night is expressly mentioned on St. Paul's return journey in this very book (23, 31). To argue that the variants of the β text need 'intima rerum cognitio' and could only have been penned by Luke himself is merely to maintain a paradox. Any body could make them, and after all they only tell us that Paul spent the night at 'a certain village' and that for these few hours of sleep he was specially conducted to the house of 'one Mnason a Cypriot and an ancient disciple.' That he received kindly hospitality at Jerusalem seems a fact worth recording, but at whose house he slept in an unknown village for a single night is a matter of infinite unimportance.

Taking the second case which Dr. Blass quotes, we find that in 1, 5 the promise of 'the Spirit' is *οὐ μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας*, while β adds *ἐὼς τῆς πεντηκόστης*, and 2, 1 α gives *καὶ ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς πενι*, while β has *καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις τοῦ συμπλ. τὴν ἡμ. τῆς πεντ.* Dr. Blass explains the reading of α in 2, 1 as placing the outpouring of the Spirit on some day *preceding* Pentecost ('*ἐν τῷ συμπλ.* = cum in eo esset ut complerentur, *i.e.* brevi ante diem pent.'), a meaning which β clearly indicates; and he is possibly right, for *ἐν τῷ συμπλ. τὰς ἡμ.* both here and in Luke 9, 51 is a very ambiguous phrase. But what possible reason can there be for asserting that the β version can only come from the pen of Luke? As with the preceding passage we may form conjectural guesses as to its origin, but we can do nothing more, and the editor who quotes these two passages among the leading proofs of his theory can at best only expect a verdict of 'not proven.'

II. The variants in β (i.) in many places exhibit the clear characteristics of later additions, and (ii.) in many others are of such a nature that, if they had stood in the original draft, no reason can be assigned for Luke (or indeed for any one) altering them.

Appended are some of these variants arranged roughly in groups, the reading of α being in each case given first.

(*A*).

5, 32 *τῶν ῥημάτων τούτων*; β. adds *πάντων*.

6, 10 *ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πνεύματι ᾧ ἐλάλει*; β. adds *διὰ τὸ ἐλέγχεσθαι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας*.

9, 5 *ὁ δὲ (εἶπεν)*; β. gives *ὁ δὲ τρέμων τε καὶ θαμβῶν ἐπὶ τῷ γεγονότι αὐτῷ εἶπεν*.

9, 20 *ἐκήρυσσεν*; β. adds *μέτα πάσης παρρησίας*.

10, 33 *παραγενόμενος*; β. *ἐν τάχει παραγενόμενος*.

10, 41 *συνεπίομεν αὐτῷ μέτα τὸ ἀναστῆναι*; β. *συνεπίομεν αὐτῷ καὶ συνεστράφημεν μετ' αὐτοῦ ἡμέρας τεσσεράκοντα μ. τ. α.*

12, 13 *σκωληκόβρωτος ἐξέψυξεν*; β. adds *ἔτι ζῶν* before *ἐξ.*

14, 9 *ἤκουεν τοῦ* Π.; β. *ἡδέως ἤκουεν*.

14, 10 *καὶ ἅλατο*; β. *καὶ εὐθέως παραχρῆμα ἅλατο*.

19, 7 *ἐπαρρησίαζετο*; β. adds *ἐν δύναμει μεγάλῃ*.

20, 1 *παρακαλέσας*; β. *πολλὰ παρακαλέσας*.

(*B*).

6, 8 *ἐποίει...σημεῖα μέγαλα ἐν τῷ λάῳ*: β. adds *διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος κυρίου (Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ)*.

9, 7 *ἐπιθεὶς ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὴν χεῖρα* ; *β. ἐπέθηκεν αὐτῷ τὴν χεῖρα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ.*

9, 40 *Ταβιθὰ ἀνάστηθι· ἡ δὲ ἤνοιξεν...* ; *β. Ταβιθὰ ἀνάστηθι ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ· ἡ δὲ παραχρῆμα ἤνοιξεν.*

14, 10 *ἀνάστηθι* ; *β. σοὶ λέγω, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ ἀνάστηθι.*

16, 4 *παρεδίδοσαν αὐτοῖς φυλάσσειν τὰ δόγματα* ; *β.* has *ἐκήρυσσον αὐτοῖς μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν χριστόν, ἅμα παραδίδοντες...*

18, 4 *διελέγετο* ; *β.* adds *ἐντιθεὶς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ.*

18, 8 *ἐπίστευον καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο* ; *β.* has *ἐβαπτίζοντο, πιστεύοντες τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ.*

8, 37 is inserted from *β. εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Φίλιππος· εἰ πιστεύεις ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου· ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ εἶπε· πιστεύω τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι τὸν Ἰησοῦν.* (Dr. Blass says 'facile intelligitur et a plena narratione haec abesse non potuisse et potuisse a contractiore.' The 'facile' is beyond me.)

(*C*).

7, 55 *Ἰησοῦν* ; *β. Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον.*

13, 32 *Ἰησοῦν* ; *β. τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν χριστόν.*

20, 21 *εἰς τὸν κυρίον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν* ; *β. διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησου χριστοῦ.*

(*D*).

15, 7 *Πέτρος εἶπεν* : *β. Πέτρος ἐν πνέυματι ἁγίῳ εἶπεν.*

15, 29 *εὖ πράξετε* ; *β. εὖ πράξετε, φερόμενοι ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι.*

15, 32 *προφῆται ὄντες* ; *β. προφῆται ὄντες πλῆρεις πνέυματος ἁγίου.*

19, 4 *ἐγένετο...Παῦλον διελθόντα* ; *β. θέλοντος δὲ τοῦ Παύλου κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν βουλὴν πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱερ. εἶπεν αὐτῷ τὸ πνεῦμα.*

20, 3 *ἐγένετο γνώμης ὑποστρέφειν* ; *β. εἶπεν δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῷ ὑποστρέφειν.*

The characteristic of the variants in group *A* is to exaggerate the emphasis, in *B* to bring in religious formula, in *B* and *C* to substitute for the simpler and natural names of Jesus a later and more theological title, and in *D* to emphasize words and actions as inspired, while another large group might have been added of variants which are purely explanatory (*e.g.* 5, 35 *αὐτοὺς* but *β. τοὺς ἄρχοντας καὶ τοὺς συνέδρους*). The whole of them bear traces of being subsequent corrections of the text by a second-rate hand; that they were Luke's original version is incredible. If Peter said to Tabitha and Paul to the cripple 'Rise up in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ,' why should Luke in both cases first so state and then afterwards in both cases strike out all the words except *ἀνάστηθι*?

(ii.) It is needless to labour the second point, viz. that in many cases, if *β* were original, no reason for altering it can be assigned, because the notes which Dr. Blass continually makes upon the *β* text are fatal to his own argument. The explanations given in that text are often good and the editor in his reverence for it perpetually inserts such notes as these, 'in *β* structura clarior'; 'verior hic fortasse lectio *β*'; 'disertius *β* quam *α*'; 'male sunt haec in *α* conexa, et secundum *β*...'; 'disertius D[1]'; 'magis arridet lectio D'; '*β* transitum parat ad sequentia, quae in *α* valde abrupte adjecta sunt.' But, surely, if these notes are justified, why did Luke, who was a writer of at least considerable skill, first write what was clear and good, and then deliberately substitute for it what was inferior and confusing?

On the whole the value of the *β* variants seems very small. The question of their origin may occupy the attention of scholars with ample leisure and does not seem to admit of any solution, but they add practically nothing to our real knowledge of the Acts, while they frequently mar and spoil what they seek to improve. The final verses of our present text are a model of powerful composition, while the rhythmic beauty of their closing cadence—*μέτα πάσης παρρησίας ἀκωλύτως*—might strike even an unpractised ear, but, when there is a desire to drag in theological formulae, nothing is sacred, and the *β* text tacks on to it the words *λέγων ὅτι οὗτός ἐστίν ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, δι' οὗ μέλλει πᾶς ὁ κόσμος κρίνεσθαι.* 'Non inepte,' says Dr. Blass, 'hoc in fine libri ponitur.' Most people will not agree with him, and, even on his own theory, the opinion of Luke must have been different for, after writing the words he deliberately struck them out.

T. E. Page.

[1] *i.e.* codex Bezae.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

DE RIDDER ON EARLY GREEK BRONZE RELIEFS.

De ectypis quibusdam aeneis quae falso vocantur 'Argivo-Corinthiaca.' A. DE RIDDER. Paris, 1896.

THIS little *brochure* is a piece of special pleading against the generally-received views of Furtwaengler and other authorities on early Greek bronze reliefs. Hitherto it has generally been accepted on Furtwaengler's authority that they are of Corinthian, or rather Argivo-Corinthian, origin; the object of this book is to shew that they are almost entirely Ionian, to a great extent Chalcidian, in their affinities. We are not sure that the author has proved his case; many of his arguments are by no means convincing, and rest far too much on subtle and minor differences, as for instance the presence or absence of certain ornamental patterns on Corinthian vases, or from the use of certain animals and exclusion of others.

The author betrays a certain vagueness on the matter of 'Chalcidian' vases. After stating (correctly enough) on p. 40 that no *certain* Chalcidian vases exist except such as bear inscriptions in the alphabet of Chalkis, he argues on p. 68 that the chariot *en face* is only found on Chalcidian, never on Corinthian vases. But there are several vases existing which do not bear Chalcidian inscriptions, and yet are decorated with chariots *en face* (*e.g.* Louvre Cat. E 648; Brit. Mus. B 15). Now the Louvre vase here quoted is undoubtedly Corinthian; the Brit. Mus. vase also appears to be, although Loeschcke (*Athen. Mittheil.* 1894, p. 516, note 1) attributes it rather arbitrarily to Chalkis.

The term 'Peloponnesian art' is a veritable red rag to M. de Ridder. He even maintains that the chest of Kypselos must have been Ionian, not Corinthian; yet the evidence of the inscriptions given by Pausanias points to a Doric dialect and Corinthian alphabet; the subjects find their closest parallel in the Corinthian vases; while the whole history of the chest is in close connection with Corinth. Further he is reduced to the necessity of maintaining that the one inscription occurring on these reliefs, which is in the Argive alphabet, that of the ἄλιος γέρων, may be a later addition, and does not necessarily connote Argive manufacture.

A few other small points may be noted, which also call for comment. The bronze relief from Eleutherae referred to on p. 59, now in the British Museum, must be Corinthian; the peculiar head-dress is also found on Corinthian vases (*e.g. Brit. Mus. Vase Cat.* ii. B 18), and is certainly not Ionic. No mention is made of the lower row of figures on the Polledrara bust (*Journ. Hell. Stud.* 1894, pl. 8); they are quite Ionian in character, and as specimens of Ionian bronze reliefs would have furnished M. de Ridder with a useful argument.

On p. 43, note 13, is a reference to *Journ. Hell. Stud.* 1891, pl. 5, which proves to be a plan of Salamis (Cyprus), although we are prepared to expect a Proto-Corinthian vase, *not* the Macmillan lekythos, as that is referred to immediately below; no other Proto-Corinthian vase has been published in the *Journ. Hell. Stud.* except the Geryon pyxis (vol v. (1884), p. 176).

P. 45, '*aenea* ectypa Perugiae reperta' should be 'argentea'; also the reference should be to the *Römische Mittheil.* for 1894, not 1895. On pp. 36, 40 occurs the curious plural form 'aryballa'; this does not appear to find authority in Greek literature; but the word does not occur at all in classical Latin.

M. de Ridder has perhaps been carried away too much by enthusiasm for his own line of argument; but at the same time he must be recognised as one of the greatest authorities on early Greek bronze work, as his catalogues of the Athens collections testify; the knowledge and research he displays demand our heartiest commendation, and will, we trust, inspire others to turn their attention to this very important subject which has hitherto been somewhat neglected. We can confidently recommend a perusal of this work to all students of Greek art.

H. B. WALTERS.

Journal of Hellenic Studies, vol. xvi. part 2. 1896.

10. Karian Sites and Inscriptions. Part ii. W. R. Paton and J. L. Myres. With two plates, and cuts.

Notes on the Latmos district and early tombs; question of early civilisation of Caria discussed.

11. A Scarab from Cyprus. G. D. Pierides. With cut.

Describes a gem with Herakles slaying the lion, of Graeco-Phoenician work.

12. I. A Stone Tripod at Oxford. P. Gardner. With plate and two cuts.

The tripod is a Greek original of the fifth century, resembling one found at Olympia.

II. The Mantinean Basis. P. Gardner. With two cuts.

An arrangement of the three slabs on the front of the base, so as to dispense with the necessity of imagining a fourth now lost.

13. A Kylix with a new καλός name. Cecil Smith. With plate.

The cup belongs to the Epiktetan cycle; the new name is Akestor.

14. The Game of Polis and Plato's *Rep.* 422 E. W. Ridgeway. With five cuts.

A discussion of the game, illustrated by existing specimens of ancient draughtsmen and boards.

15. Excavations at Abae and Hyampolis in Phocis. V. W. Yorke. With plate and five cuts.

A description of the sites and inscriptions found there.

16. Epigraphical Notes from Eastern Macedonia and Thrace. J. A. R. Munro.

Publishes inscriptions collected in 1896.

17. A Greek Goldsmith's Mould in the Ashmolean Museum. H. S. Jones. With five cuts.

Discusses early graved metal-work and the subjects treated; traces the origin of this industry to Chalcis and Corinth.

18. Archaeology in Greece, 1895–6. Cecil Smith. I. General. II. Melos. H. B. W.

Jahrbuch des K. deutschen Arch. Inst. Bd. xii. Part. i. 1897.

1. H. Dragendorff. Zwei altattische Malereien auf Marmor. Two plates. Publishes (1) disc with portrait of the physician Aineios in Athens Museum; A. was a Coan Asklepiad and lived about B.C. 520; (2) two fragments of shield with snakes from border of aegis in relief on exterior and upper part of Nike painted on interior; style of painting to be compared with best r.f. vases; about B.C. 500.

2. E. Pernice. Die Korinthischen Pinakes im Antiquarium der Königlichen Museum. 37 cuts.

Corrects and completes descriptions in Furtwängler's catalogue, necessitated by subsequent careful cleaning and examination; several joins made, and some new fragments described.

3. A. Michaelis. Eine alexandrinische Erzfigur des Goetheschen Sammlung. Two cuts.

Publishes statuette of small man in cap, looking back and making a gesture with right hand; style points to Ptolemaic Egypt, and features of Bedouin type.

4. E. Petersen. Vasenscherbe von Tell-Defenneh.

Refers subject of one fragment (man attacking woman with sword) to story of Odysseus and Kirke.

Anzeiger: Archaeologische Mitheilungen aus Süd-Russland. Die westdeutschen Altertumssammlungen (Metz, Mainz, Trier, etc.; recent acquisitions). Meetings of Arch. Gesellschaft (address by Schöne on E. Curtius; Trendelenburg on paintings in temple of Zeus at Olympia, etc.). Bibliography and summary of archaeological journals. H. B. W.

Revue Numismatique. Part i. 1897.

The *Revue*, established in 1837, enters this year on a new series (the fourth). The *Annuaire de la société française de Numismatique*, which from time to time contained articles on classical numismatics, has been discontinued, but its contributors will now give their support to the *Revue Numismatique*. The present number contains the first instalment of an article by M. R. Mowat on 'Combinaisons secrètes de lettres dans le marques monétaires de l'Empire Romain.'

Numismatische Zeitschrift. Vol. xxviii. for 1896. (Vienna, 1897).

M. Bahrfeldt. 'Nachträge und Berichtungen zur Münzkunde der römischen Republik.' This article, the concluding part of which will appear in vol. xxix. occupies pp. 1 to 170 and is illustrated by cuts and twelve plates. It consists principally of additions to Babelon's *Monnaies de la république romaine.* O. Seeck. 'Sesterz und Follis.'

Revue suisse de Numismatique. Vol. vi.

Imhoof-Blumer. 'Zur Münzkunde Kleinasiens' (part 3). Deals with the coinage of numerous Lydian cities. The following points may be noted. *Bagis.* Valerian on horse, and three Phrygian soldiers: a type commemorating the 'Victoria Parthica' of 259. *Daldis Flaviopolis.* Coins with the name of *Flaviopolis* (in honour of Vespasian and Titus) and *Flavia Caesarea.* A new type with a curious terminal figure of Herakles (Pl. iii. 18). *Germe.* It is satisfactorily shown that the coins bearing the name of Germe belong to the Lydian Germe on the Caicus and not to Germe on the Rhyndacus. *Heraklcia on the Sipylos.* All the coins hitherto attributed to this town seem to be mis-described, and belong elsewhere. *Hermokapelia.* On the site etc. The coin supposed to read Thyessos is probably of Thessalonica. *Hypaipa.* The veiled cultus-statue on the coins is probably that of Artemis Anaitis: a lighted altar of unusual (conical) form, placed in a temple, is perhaps connected with the fire-worship practised by Persians in Hypaipa in the time of Pausanias (Paus. v. 27, 3). *Mossyna.* All the coins hitherto attributed to this place belong elsewhere. *Paktolos.* No town of this name is known and the supposed coins of Paktolos are mis-read pieces of other places. *Philadelphia.* Under Caligula and Claudius struck coins with the name of 'Neocaesarea.' One coin (Pl. v. 11) bears the portrait of Tiberius Gemellus, son of the younger Drusus. *Sala.* Called on its coins 'Domitianopolis' in the time of Domitian. *Sardis.* A bronze coin (Pl. v. 23) with the portrait of Albinus, an Emperor whose portrait was hitherto only known—at least as far as the coins of Greek cities are concerned—at Pautalia, Smyrna and Side.

WARWICK WROTH.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

American Journal of Philology. Vol. xvii, 4. Whole No. 68. Dec. 1896.

Contributions to the Interpretation of the Veda, M. Bloomfield. *On the text of the Truculentus of Plautus,* W. M. Lindsay. Considers that a sudden change of script in the archetype may have been the real cause of the change for the worse in our Plautine text at the beginning of the Truculentus. *Brugmann's Law and the Sanskrit Vṛddhi,* C. D. Buck. Maintains that certain form categories in Sanskrit

which are most simply explained through Brugmann's Law—the equation of European *o* with Skt. *ā* in open syllables—are intelligible without our having recourse to this law. *Latin Glosses*, O. B. Schlutter. explains many of the glosses in the Corpus Glossarum.

Reviews and Book Notices. Delitzsch's *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch* 'a great work.' Thumb's *Handbuch der neugriechischen Volkssprache* 'deserves to be studied by all classical students sojourning in Greece.' Fitch's *De Argonautarum Reditu Quaestiones Selectae* 'in so uncertain and difficult a subject his results may be accepted as tenable, at least until new combinations are brought to impugn them.'

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Vol. 52, 2. 1897.

Studien zu Ciceros Briefen an Atticus (IX, X), O. E. Schmidt. Maintains against C. A. Lehmann his already published view, that the Mediceus is the foundation for the text, and examines special passages in support. *Zu attischen Dionysos-Festen*, A Körte. (1) Confutes Gilbert's theory, which has been adopted by Dörpfeld, that the Lenaea were nothing but the last day of the Anthesteria. (2) Attempts to explain the difficulty that the great Dionysian list of victors knows of no Agon of comic actors at the great Dionysia. (3) The harp-player Nikokles probably won his victory not earlier than 280 B.C. *Anecdoton Fulgentianum*, R. Helm. Maintains the probability of the authorship of Fulgentius the Mythographer for the *super Thebaide*. *Buphonien*, H. von Prott. Investigates the origin of this Attic feast. *Zu lateinischen Dichtern*, M. Ihm. (1) The comic Epyllion *vespae judicium coci et pistoris judice Vulcano*. (2) The *Carmen contra Flavianum* (Cod. Paris, 8084). (3) A lost poem of Damasus? *Beiträge zur Quellenkunde des Orients im Alterthum*, L. Jeep. Chiefly with reference to the epitome of Church-History by Philostorgius. *Zu den Assyriaka des Ktesias*, P. Krumbholz. Continued from vol. 50 [Cl. Rev. ix. 285]. As we know that the information of Diodorus about Assyria comes from Ktesias, so we find that Justin stands in nearer or further relation to him. *Varia*, W. Kroll.

Miscellen. *Zwei Vermuthungen zur griechischen Kunstgeschichte*, J. Ziehen. (1) On a bronze statuette at Vienna. (2) On a work of Euphranor mentioned by Pliny. *Der Brand von Lugudunum*, O. Hirschfeld. This, mentioned in 91st letter of Seneca, took place probably at the beginning of 65 A.D. *Expletur lacuna in Libanii declamatione quae inscribitur μάγου κατηγορία*, R. Förster. *Zur Ueberlieferung der Physiognomik des Adamantios*, R. Förster. *Ein neuentdecktes Priscianbruchstück*, C. Heldmann. Here first published. *Carmen epigraphium*, F. B. Recently found at the church of S. Ursula in Cologne. *Carpus*, E. Lommatzsch. This is the name of Trimalchio's carver (Petron. c. 36), and it is here explained. The Latin *carpere* has no connexion with *καρπός* 'fruit,' but probably with *καρπός* 'wrist.'

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

Aeschylus. Preuss (A.) De versuum iambicorum in melicis partibus usu Aeschyleo. 8vo. 118 pp. Leipzig.

Anthologia. Wachtler (A.) Studien zum Buche der palatinischen Anthologie. 8vo. 22 pp. Villach.

Aristophanes. Traduction nouvelle par E. Talbot. Préface de Sully-Prudhomme. 2 vols. 8vo. viii, 412; 515 pp. Paris, Lemerre. 15 fr.

—— Heidhues (B.) Ueber die Wolken des Aristophanes. 4to. 59 pp. Köln.

—— Passow (W.) De Aristophane defendendo contra invasionem Euripideam. I: de terminis parodiae. 4to. 23 pp. Hirschberg.

Aristoteles. Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca. Vol. XV. Joannis Philoponi in Aristotelis de anima libros commentaria, ed. M. Hayduck. 8vo. xix, 670 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 27 Mk.

Ballin (F.) Italienische Herbsttage. Erinnerungen an den fünften archäologischen Kursus (1895) deutscher Gymnasiallehrer in Italien. 4to. 34 pp. Dessau.

Beauchet (L.) Histoire du droit privé de la République athénienne. 4 vols. 8vo. iii, 545; 556; 752; 579 pp. Paris, Chevalier-Maresq. 36 fr.

Biltz (O.) Der Phädo Plato's und Mendelssohns. 8vo. 63 pp. Berlin, Mayer & M. 1 Mk. 50.

Callegari (E.) Imprese militari e morte di Alessandro Severo. 8vo. 72 pp. Padua.

Curtius. Korb (F.) Der Gebrauch des Infinitivus bei Q. Curtius Rufus. I. 8vo. 19 pp. Prag.

Demosthenes. Bethe (E.) Demosthenis scriptorum corpus ubi et qua aetate collectum editumque sit. 4to. 16 pp. Rostock.

—— Wagner (H.) Appellatio adversus Eubulidem num Demostheni abiudicanda sit. 8vo. 44 pp. Würzburg.

Dio Chrysostomus. Hahn (C.) De Dionis Chrysostomi orationibus, quae inscribuntur Diogenes (VI, VIII, IX, X.) 8vo. 73 pp. Göttingen.

Eickhoff (H.) Zwei Schriften des Basilius und des Augustinus als geschichtliche Dokumente der Vereinigung von klassischer Bildung und Christentum. 4to. 21 pp. Schleswig.

Festus Avienus. Fischer (P. G.) Der gestirnte Himmel. Versuch einer Uebersetzung der Aratea des Rufus Festus Avienus. (V. 930—Schluss.) 8vo. 23 pp. Komotau.

Fitch (E.) De Argonautarum reditu quaestiones selectae. 8vo. 77 pp. Göttingen.

Freytag (J.) De Anonymi *περὶ ὕψους* sublimi genere dicendi. 8vo. 82 pp. Hildesheim.

Froelich (G.) Quatenus in nominibus hominum Doricorum propriis historici Graeci formis dialecticis usi vel Atticam dialectum secuti sint. II. 4to. 16 pp. Insterburg.

Haube (O.) Die Epen der römischen Litteratur im Zeitalter der Republik. II. 4to. 11 pp. Schrimm.

Herkenrath (R.) Studien zu den griechischen Grabschriften. 8vo. 56 pp. Feldkirch.

Hirzel. Die Homonymie der griechischen Götter nach der Lehre antiker Theologen. 8vo. 61 pp. Leipzig.

Homeri Odysseae carmina cum apparatu critico ediderunt J. van Leeuwen, J. F. et M. B. Mendes da Costa. Pars I. Carmen I.–XII. 8vo. xxvii, 292 pp. Leiden, Sijthoff. 3 Mk.

—— Dühr. Homer's Odyssee in niederdeutscher poetischer Übertragung. Proben aus den ersten Büchern. 4to. 18 pp. Nordhausen.

—— Irmscher (E.) Homers Odyssee, Buch XXII, Nachdichtung. 4to. 10 pp. Dresden.

Horatius. Handel (S.) De troporum apud Horatium usu. Pars prior: Carmina. 8vo. 42 pp. Brody.

Inscriptions grecques et latines da la Syrie publiées par Waddington. Index alphabétique et analytique, redigé par J. B. Chabot. 4to. 27 pp. (From 'Revue Archéologique,' 1896.) Paris.

Jahn (P.) Die Art der Abhängigkeit Vergils von Theokrit. 4to. 29 pp. Berlin.

Köhler (Ulr.) Ueber Probleme der griechischen Vorzeit. 8vo. 17 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 1 Mk. 50.
(Aus 'Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin.')

Lamer (Jo.) De choriambicis Graecorum poetarum versibus. 8vo. 142 pp. Leipzig, Gräfe. 2 Mk.

Literaturdenkmäler (lateinische) des xv. und xvi. Jahrhunderts, herausgegeben von M. Hermann. 13: Macropedius (van Langveldt) (Georgius): Rebelles und Aluta, herausgegeben von Johs. Bolte. 12 mo. xlii, 104 pp., engravings and musical notation. Berlin, Weidmann. 3 Mk.

Mair (G.) Ἑλληνικά. 8vo. 16 pp. Villach.

Meister. Ein altthessalisches Ehrendekret für den Korinthier Sotairos. 8vo. 16 pp. Leipzig.

—— Die Depositionsurkunde des Xuthias. 8vo. 11 pp., 1 plate. Leipzig.

Meyer (C. F. E.) Philologische Miscellen. II. 4to. 20 pp. Herford.

Minucius Felix. Synnerberg (C.) Randbemerkungen zu Minucius Felix. 8vo. 23 pp. Helsingfors. 1 Mk.
(Aus 'Finska's Vetenskabs-Societetens Förhandlingar.')

—— Norden (E.) De Minucii Felicis aetate et genere dicendi. 8vo. 62 pp. Greifswald.

Nicolai (W.) Beiträge zur Geschichte der Christenverfolgungen. 4to. 18 pp. Eisenach.

Ochler (Raim.) Der letzte Feldzug des Barkiden Hasdrubal und die Schlacht am Metaurus. Mit Beiträgen von F. Hultsch und V. Pittaluga. 8vo. 82 pp., maps. (Berliner Studien für classische Philologie, New Series, Vol. II, 1.) Berlin, Calvary. 3 Mk.

Ovidius. Krassowsky (W.) Ovidius quomodo in isdem fabulis enarrandis a se ipso discrepuerit. 8vo. 38 pp. Königsberg.

Parmenides' Lehrgedicht, griechisch und deutsch von H. Diels. Mit Anhang über griechische Thüren und Schlösser. 8vo. 164 pp., engravings. Berlin, Reimer. 5 Mk.

Petersdorff (R.) Uebereinstimmende Nachrichten über die alten Griechen und Germanen aus Homer und Tacitus. I. 4to. 23 pp. Strehlen.

Pherekydes. Diels (H.) Zur Pentemychos des Pherekydes. 8vo. 13 pp. Berlin.

Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt, ediderunt Leop. Cohn et P. Wendland. Voll. II, ed. P. Wendland. 8vo. xxxiv, 315 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 9 Mk.

Plathner. Die Alleinherrschaft der Peisistratiden. 4to. 19 pp. Dessau.

Plato. Berdolt (W.) Der Folgesatz bei Plato. Mit historisch-grammatischer Einleitung: Der Konsekutivsatz in der älteren griechischen Litteratur. 8vo. 103 pp. Würzburg.

—— Böhme (J.) Zur Protagoras-Frage. 4to. 26 pp. Hamburg.

—— Lüddecke (K.) Die Frage der Echtheit und Abfassungszeit des Euthydemus. 8vo. 49 pp. Celle.

—— Reiter. De Platonis proprietate quadam dicendi. 4to. 25 pp. Braunsberg.

Plautus' Rudens übersetzt von Dr. G. Schmilinsky. 4to. 18 pp. Halle. 1 Mk.

Reich (H.) Die ältesten berufsmässigen Darsteller des griechisch-italischen Mimus. 8vo. 36 pp. Königsberg.

Reinach (S.) Répertoire de la statuaire grecque et romaine. Vol. I. 16mo. lxiv, 661 pp. Paris, Leroux. 5 fr.

Röhl (H.) Zu griechischen und lateinischen Texten (Älian, Anthologia Pal., Athenäus, Cicero, Horaz, Inscriptiones Atticae, Isocrates, Polybius, Thucydides, Xenophon, Xenophon Ephes.) 4to. 18 pp. Halberstadt.

Sallustius. Kunze (Alfr.) Sallustiana. Pt. 3. Zur Stilistik. I. Beiträge zur Darstellung der genetischen Entwickelung des Sallustianischen Stils. 8vo. xiv, 95 pp. Leipzig, Simmel.

Schmeding (Prof.) Die neusten Forschungen über das klassische Altertum, insbesondere das klassische Griechenland. 8vo. 56 pp. Osterwieck. 80 Pf.

Schöne (A.) Ueber die Ironie in der griechischen Dichtung, insbesondere bei Homer, Aeschylus und Sophocles. 8vo. 23 pp. Kiel.

Schurz (W.) Die Militärreorganisation Hadrians. I. 4to. 26 pp. Gladbach.

Seeliger (K.) Messenien und der achäische Bund. 4to. 32 pp. Zittau.

Seneca. Müller (Jo.) Kritische Studien zu den Briefen Seneca's. 8vo. 32 pp. Wien, Gerold. 90 Pf.
(Aus 'Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien.')

Siebert. Die ältesten Zeugnisse über das Christentum bei den römischen Schriftstellern. 4to. 32 pp. Charlottenburg.

Solon. Heinemann (J.) Studia Solonea. 8vo. 50 pp. Berlin.

Sophocles. Haberlant (O.) De figurae quae vocatur etymologicae usu Sophocleo. 4to. 33 pp. Freienwalde.

—— Rademann (A.) Adnotationum ad Sophoclis Oedipi Tyranni vers. 863–910. 4to. 14 pp. Kottbus.

Tauber (G.) Ueber die grundverschiedene dramatische Verwertung des Iphigienienstoffes durch Euripides und Goethe. 8vo. 26 pp. Prag.

Tacitus. Liesegang (H.) I. De Taciti vita et scriptis. II. Quo consilio Tacitus Germaniam scripsisse videatur. 4to. 11 pp. Cleve.

—— Novák (Rob.) Analecta Tacitea. 8vo. 23 pp. Prag, Storch. 1 Mk.
(Aus 'Ceské Museum Filologické.')

Teichmüller (F.) Grundbegriff und Gebrauch von auctor und auctoritas: I. Auctor. 4to. 23 pp. Wittstock.

Terentianus. Werth (A.) De Terentiani metris et elocutione. 8vo. 44 pp. Mühlheim.

Weise (P.) Ueber den Weinbau der Römer. I. 4to. 21 pp. Hamburg.

Weisweiler (J.) Die consecutio temporum nebst ihren Voraussetzungen aus der Modus- und Tempuslehre. Ein Kapitel der lateinischen Schulgrammatik. 4to. 12 pp. Tremessen.

Werber (K.) Tertullians Schrift de spectaculis in ihrem Verhältnisse zu Varros rerum divinarum libri. 8vo. 31 pp. Teschen.

Wissowa (G.) Analecta Romana topographica. 4to. 19 pp. Halle.

The Classical Review

OCTOBER 1897.

NOTES TO THE *AGRICOLA* OF TACITUS.

Agr. 4, 15: studium philosophiae acrius, *ultra* quam concessum Romano *ac senatori*, hausisse.

The reading of the MSS. is quite generally retained. But 'ultra-senatori,' as an asyndetic epexegesis, wedged in between *acrius* and *hausisse*, which belong together, seems extremely awkward, nor can *ultra* well be separated from the rest of the clause and joined asyndetically to *acrius*. I therefore believe that Baehrens has for once been right in demanding *ultraque* (cod. A ultra $\hat{q}$), a very easy emendation, the error being due to haplography, but I cannot accept Baehrens' reason for the correction, as the 'asyndeton bimembre,' even of synonyms, for so he regards *acrius* and *ultra*, is common enough in Tacitus.[1]

That *ac senatori* 'and a senator at that' is quite inapplicable to the youthful Agricola has been pointed out by Peerlkamp, but with that wanton recklessness, so characteristic of him, he athetizes the entire clause. It seems more reasonable to regard only *ac senatori* as a very natural gloss of some ancient reader which subsequently crept into the text.

Agr. 6, 15: idem praeturae *certior* et silentium.

Among the numerous substitutes suggested for the unintelligible reading of the MSS., such as otium, terror, torpor, languor, secretum, only *tenor*, the emendation of *Rhenanus*, has met with general favour. It unquestionably gives an excellent sense, and the expression is to a certain measure supported by analogies in other writers, notably Livy. Cf. *e.g.* IV. 10, 9 consulatus eodem tenore gesti VII. 32, 16, 40, 9 VIII. 38, 11 XXII. 15, 1 XL. 12. Ovid Her. XVII. 14. Plin. Pan. 91, 6. And yet this conjecture, ingenious as it is, ought not to have been accepted.

In the first place, no one, I fancy, will seriously contend, that the corruption from *tenor* to *certior* has the slightest palaeographical probability. In the second place, *tenor* occurs nowhere else in Tacitus; but to thrust a ἅπαξ εἰρημένον into an ancient author, simply because it happens to satisfy the sense, is a very questionable proceeding and scarcely, if ever, justifiable on any methodical grounds.

Hence, if the passage is not to be given up in despair, as a 'locus insanabilis,' we must find some word which plausibly accounts for the existing corruption and at the same time satisfies what is felt to be the meaning of the author. Such a word, I am convinced, is *rector*, out of which *certior* arose by *metathesis*, just as we find in a number of MSS. to Hor. Ep. II. 1, 105 *certis* erroneously written for *rectis*. *Rector* and similarly *regere* are often used in the sense of 'to administer,' both in Tacitus and elsewhere. The meaning of the entire passage would then be: Agricola administered (conducted) his praetorship in the same quiet manner as his earlier offices, and in consequence[2] there was the same dearth of noteworthy features. The collocation of a concrete and abstract

[1] Cf. *Joh. Müller*, Beiträge zur Kritik u. Erklärung des Tacitus I. pp. 6 ff.

[2] The *et* is epexegetic, as in *Dial.* 36, 10 leges adsiduae et populare nomen. See my note to *Dial.* 7, 16 (p. 106).

noun (rector et silentium) is peculiarly Tacitean. Not to go beyond the 'smaller works,' we may compare *Agr.* 24, 11. 25, 7. 28, 4. 38, 1 *G.* 7, 15. 33, 7.

Agr. 6, 17: ludos et inania honoris *medio rationis* atque abundantiae duxit.

A much disputed passage. I shall not here dwell upon the meaning of *duxit* which, in spite of what has been written about it,[1] may, without any violence, be taken in the sense of *edere*, although generally so used only with 'funus, exsequiae' and the like,[2] for Tacitus is fond of giving a novel turn to stereotype and formulaic expressions.

Far more serious, in my judgment, are the objections that may be urged against *rationis*, the traditional text. To support it, modern editors are compelled to understand by *ratio* 'shrewd calculation, kluge Berechnung' which, we are told, passes by an easy transition into the meaning of 'economy, Sparsamkeit,' the signification demanded here. Now we may at once admit that *ratio*, a rather Protean word, does frequently come to mean 'shrewd calculation'; we may also grant, that in a man of Agricola's character such 'calculation' would under the circumstances have led him to practise economy, but *ratio* itself never has this connotation, and hence it does not constitute the antithesis to *abundantia* unquestionably intended by the author, particularly when we remember that the self-same *ratio*, in the case of innumerable Roman praetors, resulted in most lavish extravagance at the public games, by which means they hoped to acquire popularity. *Lipsius*, evidently feeling the difficulty just pointed out, read *moderationis* for 'medio rationis.'[3] A far more plausible correction, and equally easy, is to write 'medio moderationis atque abundantiae,' 'mode' being omitted as an alleged dittography of 'medio' (mdo). As for the meaning here assigned to *moderatio*, cp. Cic. de *Off.* I. 27 ext.: ut in eo *moderatio* et temperantia appareat cum specie quadam liberali (= longe a luxuria), Tac. *Ann.* III. 54, 13: cur olim *parsimonia* poilebat? quia sibi quisque *moderabatur*.

Agr. 8, 2: placidius (sc. praeerat) quam feroci provincia dignum *est*.

Acidalius proposed *esset*. This has justly been rejected as unnecessary, but Tacitus very probably did not write *est* at all, for he invariably *omits* the copula after *dignum*, the passage in *H.* I. 15 est tibi frater pari nobilitate, natu maior, dignus hac fortuna constituting no exception, for obvious reasons.[4]

Agr. 9, 8: ubi officio satisfactum, nullam ultra potestatis personam.

All recent editors, so far as they do not resort to very arbitrary changes, read 'nulla ...persona,' taking it as an ablative of quality or as a nominative, *erat* being understood in either case. They also assume that the accusative of the MSS. is due to the misinterpretation of 'ultra' as a preposition. But plausible as this seems, I am inclined to believe with Clemm,[5] that we have here but another instance of the ellipsis of *agere* so common in Tacitus, e.g. *Agr.* 19, 5 nihil per libertos servosque publicae rei (sc. egit) *H.* I. 84, 1 *Ann.* I. 43, 3 IV. 38, 18 XIV. 7, 11 and very similar *G.* 37, 10 medio tam longi aevi spatio multa in vicem damna (sc. facta sunt). Equally bold ellipses in the smaller works are: *Agr.* 33, 2 iamque agmina et armorum fulgores audentissimi cuiusque procursu (sc. aspiciebantur), *G.* 14, 14 materia munificentiae per bella et raptus (sc. paratur). If it be added, finally, that 'personam aliquam agere' is a construction frequently used by Tacitus (e.g. *H.* I. 30, 4 II. 83, 2 IV. 2, 3 *Ann.* I. 4, 15 XIII. 14, 4. 46, 18. XVI. 28, 11), all valid objections to the MS. reading will be removed.

Agr. 11, 11: eorum sacra deprehendas, superstitionum persuasione, sermo, etc.

Nipperdey, with that singular perversity and astonishing infelicity which distinguish all his critical contributions to the *minor* works of Tacitus, has boldly athetized the words 'superstitionum persuasione' as the gloss of a Christian scribe! Schoene cheerfully acquiesced. Others, such as Roth, Peerlkamp, Peter, Andresen, Halm retain the MSS. reading. Their explanations, however, are, if possible, more difficult than the traditional text, and *Maxa*,[6] in his exhaustive discussion of this passage, has had no trouble in refuting them. Wex, Kritz, Urlichs, Tuecking, Draeger, Gantrelle, Joh. Müller and Maxa himself, to mention only these, have accepted *persuasiones*, the

[1] See esp. *Maxa*, Progr. Radantz 1. (1885) pp. 44 ff.—These admirable discussions of the cruces in the Agricola seem to have been unduly neglected. Their author unfortunately only lived to complete fifteen chapters, the last programme being published after his death in 1887.

[2] H. IV. 47, 6 Ann. XVI. 6, 7.

[3] He gave to *duxit* the meaning of *putavit* and construed it with a genitive after the analogy of 'ratus,' *e.g.* Tac. Ann. III. 20.

[4] The same is true of 'indignus' which takes the copula only in the following passage. Ann. I. 42, 16: si . . . *aspernarctur*, tamen mirum et indignum *erat*, where its insertion is also easily accounted for.

[5] De breviloquentia Tacitea etc. p. 43 ff. Cp. also *Petzke*, Dicendi genus Tacitinum quatenus differat a Liviano, Diss. Königsberg pp. 35 ff. (1888),

[6] l.c. II. 21-26.

very easy emendation of *Glück*, the 's' having been accidentally omitted, owing to the 's' following, a notoriously common source of error. The plural of *persuasio* is also unobjectionable. It occurs *e.g.* Sen. *Ep.* 94, 30 and Plin. *N.H.* XXIX. 1, 8, 28 D. (not II. 8, 6 as cited by Maxa). The 'asyndeton bimembre,' as remarked above, is quite frequent in Tacitus, but an examination of all instances (Müller's list is not complete) reveals not a single example in which a predicate separates the two objects, as here, or a subject or object is placed between two predicates. The only word allowed to intervene in an 'asyndeton bimembre' is an attributive genitive or personal pronoun and even then *each* member is usually thus amplified, doubtless for the sake of stylistic libration. This being so, I have always felt that Tacitus wrote: 'eorum sacra deprehendas *ac* superstitionum persuasiones,' the graphical resemblance, not to say identity, between 'ac' and 'as,' the immediately preceding syllable, being responsible for the haplography. By these easy changes, we not only secure a perfectly intelligible text, not in need of far-fetched and improbable interpretations, but also a 'collocatio verborum,' supported by numerous analogies in Tacitus. Cf. e.g. *Agr.* 17 aut victoria complexus est aut bello 42 nec Agricolae consilium deerat nec Domitiano exemplum *Dial.* 34 sive accusationem susceperat sive defensionem, and similarly *Agr.* 33 inventa Britannia et subacta *G.* 11 aut incohatur luna aut impletur *Dial.* 37 intulerit ictus et exceperit, to which passage I have collected still other instances (p. 352).[1]

Agr. 12, 16: patiens frugum fecundum.

Patiens, when used absolutely, means (1) 'hard, firm, unyielding,' as e.g. *Prop.* I. 16, 29 saxo patientior *Ov.* Am. I. 15, 31 aratrum patiens or (2) 'patient, enduring' *e.g.* Caes. B.C. III. 96 miserrimo et patientissimo exercitus Cic. de orat. II. 75, 305 patiens et lentus Lael. 25, 91 pro Lig. 8, 24 ad Quint. frat. I. 1, 14 ad fam. I. 8, 4 et saep. But in the signification required here 'tolerant of, productive of, yielding,' the only meaning in which Tacitus uses the word, it always takes the genitive. Cp. Lex. Tac. s.v. *patiens* and *impatiens*, esp, *G.* 5, 3 terra...satis ferax, frugiferarum arborum [im] patiens, pecorum fecunda.

Partly for the reason given, partly prompted by the remarkable parallel passage just cited, some editors have inserted 'arborum' or 'pomorum' before *patiens;* Peter, to get rid of the 'asyndeton gradativum' reads 'pabuli fecundum,' with chiasmus, apparently forgetting that 'pabulum' is quite incompatible with 'tarde mitescunt,' immediately following.[2] Still others, as Kritz and Schoene, calmly delete *fecundum*, as a gloss, presumably of some chauvinistic scribe! Urlichs and Cornelissen join *patiens* with the preceding clause. The great majority of editors, however, solve the difficulty by simply placing the comma after *frugum*, assuming an 'asyndeton bimembre.' I should rest satisfied with this solution, which involves no change whatever, were it not for the following consideration. I know of no example where, of two asyndetic adjectives, only one of them has an attributive attached to it. Unless, therefore, we are willing to admit this solitary exception on the ground that 'frugum,' belonging, as it does, to both adjectives, was placed between them, a very common stylistic device of Tacitus, I should prefer to read: *frugum patiens, fecundum.* Such accidental transpositions are extremely numerous in all MSS. The emendation is less bold than the insertion of 'arborum' or 'pomorum,' which are objectionable also on other grounds, and somehow better subserves the function for which the asyndeton is used in this particular passage.

Agr. 17, 2: magni, duces, egregii exercitus, minuta hostium spes et terrorem statim intulit Petilius Cerialis.

This passage violates Tacitean usage in asyndetic collocations, for whenever in an asyndetic enumeration, the last member contains a new thought or a more general idea or sums up, it is joined by *et* to the asyndetic group.[3] Cf. *Agr.* 13 extr. domitae gentes, capti reges *et* monstratus fatis Vespanianus *G.* 30, 5 duriora genti corpora, stricti artus, minax vultus (physical qualities) *et* maior animi vigor 44, 5 rotunda scuta, breves gladii *et* erga reges obsequium *H.* I. 36, 12 adorare vulgum, iacere oscula *et* omnia serviliter pro dominatione IV. 1, 14 ubique lamenta, conclamationes *et* fortunae captae urbis *Ann.* I. 25, 6 murmur incertum, atrox clamor *et* repente quies. Consistency, therefore, demands '*et* minuta hostium spes.' Curiously enough, in the parallel passage from the Agricola just cited, *one* MS. omits *et* before 'monstratus,' in the

[1] According to *Maxa* l.c. II. p. 24, the insertion of 'ac' or 'et' has long ago been suggested by *Schömann*, Greifswald Index Lect. 1859-60 p. 7, but this article has not been accessible to me. *Andresen*, by some curious error, attributed 'ac-persuasiones' to *Glück*.

[2] Maxa l.c. II. p. 33.

[3] Cf. Jour. Phil. XII. pp. 454 ff. and my note to Dial. c. 37, 18 (p. 348).

present both A and B omitted it. I am also inclined to believe that Tacitus wrote: 'terrorem statim intulit,' the *et* being perhaps the very *et* which strayed away from the place, where we found it to be necessary, or else it is a mere dittography of the *es* preceding. The predicate, moreover, coming before its subject renders the omission of *et* very plausible, at least in Tacitus.

Agr. 17, 8: et Cerialis quidem alterius successoris curam famamque obruisset: sustinuit*que* molem Julius Frontinus.

So our two MSS. But modern editors have with singular unanimity abandoned this reading, the majority being content with bracketing *que*, while others suspect a lacuna, which each fills out in his own way. It does not seem to have been thought worth the while to enquire, whether the *que* may not after all be quite unobjectionable. Andresen—he reads 'sustinuit'—says 'in ipsa verbi collocatione inest gravissima vis adversativa.' This would be an excellent explanation but for the circumstance that the MSS. clearly exhibit *sustinuitque*. Now it can easily be shown that *que* very often has a 'vis adversativa.' If so, the proposed changes will not be correcting a corrupt reading but the *author* himself. This is, however, hardly the function of the critic. Moreover, I can discover no motive for the scribes, who must all have been ignorant of the stylistic observations collected in Andresen's 'De verborum apud Tacitum collocatione,' to insert a *que* on mere caprice, not to mention the fact that no one has as yet succeeded in proving the existence of a *single, deliberate interpolation* in the Agricola, for such the *que* would be, and in making this statement, I do not overlook the attempts made in that direction by Wex, Peerlkamp, Ritter, Nipperdey, Cornelissen and Schoene. The following selected list of examples at my disposal of *que* = sed will, I hope, suffice to vindicate the reading of our MSS.

Cic. de Sen. 20, 77 iam sensus moriendi aliquis esse potest, isque ad exiguum tempus *Vell.* Pat. II. 11 C. Marius hirtus atque horridus, vitaque sanctus II. 24 Sulla neque...nec quod erat in manibus omisit, existimavitque ante frangendum hostem and *Tac.* Agr. 14, 10 Didium Veranius excepit isque intra annum extinctus est H. I. 50, 22 et ambigua de Vespasiano fama (sc. erat) solusque omnium...in melius mutatus est Ann. III. 18, 12 addiderat...Tiberio et Augustae...grates omiseratque Claudii mentionem 42, 4 pellicere alam equitum...ut... bellum inciperet; paucique equitum corrupti (sc. sunt) XIII. 10, 3 Caesar effigiem Domitio...petivit a senatu; sibique statuas... prohibuit XVI. 19, 14 obsignata misit Neroni fregitque anulum. To these and other exx. given in *Lex. Tac.* s.v. *que* (p. 1282^{b} 1283^{a}), we should perhaps add Ann. III. 35, 6 IV. 4 ext. 29 ext. XI. 35, 9 XII. 14, 10.

Agr. 24, 1: Quinto expeditionum anno *nave prima* transgressus ignotas ad id tempus gentes.

A much molested passage, as may be seen from the following selection of conjectures: 'navi in proxima, aestate prima, gnave prima (neut. plur.), vere primo, marituma, nova perinde,' and, to cap the climax, 'in Clotae proxima,' to which glaringly improbable conjecture Andresen remarks 'sic optime Nipperdey' and straightway receives it into his text![1] The few who defend the reading of the MSS. usually interpret the phrase as 'the first vessel sent out at the opening of navigation in the spring,' and, indeed, if *nave prima* could bear no other signification we should certainly have to regard the passage as corrupt. All difficulty will, however, be removed, if we read *primum* (prim.) which scarcely involves any change, but even this is not necessary, for I fail to see why we should not recognise in *prima* simply another example of the well-known use of the adjective for the adverb, a suggestion which I subsequently discovered had long ago been made by *Walch* (p. 303). To the illustrations given by him, *Ag.* 19 primam (primum B *Peter*) domum suam coercuit *Ann.* XIV. 10 eum...prima Centurionum adulatio ad spem firmavit, add *G.* 43, 23 primi in omnibus proeliis, oculi vincuntur *H.* II. 96, 1 prima Vitellio tertiae legionis defectio nuntiatur *Ann.* XII. 19, 6 magnarum nationum regibus primam ex similitudine fortunae...amicitiam esse. Tacitus, it must be admitted, generally places the adjective *before* its noun, unless rhetorical reasons decree otherwise, but among the conspicuous exceptions to this practice, Andresen himself, in the article cited above (p. 20), mentions *primus*.

Agr. 28, 6: tris liburnicas adactis per vim gubernatoribus ascendere et uno *remigante*, suspectis duobus eoque interfectis .... amissis per inscitiam (sc. gubernandi) navibus.

[1] The absurdity of this violent change will become the more manifest, when the conviction has gained ground, as I am confident it will, that the whole chapter is unintelligible except on the presumption of an expedition to *Ireland*. Cf. *W. Pfitzner*, Progr. Neustrelitz 1893 pp. 34 and Fleckeisen's Jahrb. vol. 153 pp. 560—564.

It has long been recognised that the sense is incomplete and that we require the additional idea of 'back' or 'returning,' for those who, like Peter, take *remigante* = gubernante are sufficiently refuted by the clause 'amissis—navibus,' even supposing that *remigare* could have the meaning which they assign to it. Among the many remedies suggested, such as: 'remigerante; regente; remeante; remorante; refugo uno ante; refugiente; reneante; renatante; velificante; *renavigante*, only the last has met with anything like general acceptance, and yet I have always felt certain that Tacitus did not write it. Not because it does not satisfy the evident meaning of the context, for it does, but simply because it would constitute, so far as I have been able to discover, a unique instance of the corruption of a perfectly intelligible and commonplace expression into another word which is as suitable and fitting as the author in this particular case could possibly have chosen. There is, therefore, a very strong presumption that *remigante* is perfectly sound, but if so, the evident corruption now existing must lurk elsewhere. I am convinced that the original is restored by reading: '*uno* RETRO *remigante*,' the *retro* easily falling out, because of the *re* following, a species of error occurring frequently in the best MSS.

Agr. 34, 12: novissimae res et extremo metu *corpora* defixere *aciem* in his vestigiis.

'Corpora' and 'aciem' cannot both be right. The majority of critics retain the latter, changing the text so as to read: 'res et extremus metus torpore,' 'res et extremo metu torpor,' or, by a more radical change 'novissimi nimirum et extremo metu torpidi (torpidam)' while still others abandon emendation and practically rewrite the passage. Now *Wex* (p. 107 ff.) has long since shown, but apparently to no purpose, that 'aciem defixere' in the sense of 'rivetting the line of battle' is not idiomatic Latin. And even if it were, the stubborn resistance therein implied would hardly serve as a source of encouragement for a Roman army. Then again, it is not likely that Agricola, who contemptuously speaks of his opponents as a band of cowards and runaways who 'non restiterunt sed deprehrensi sunt,' would have dignified their ranks by the term 'acies.' Nor can 'aciem defixere' here have the meaning, which it has often enough elsewhere, of 'fixing one's steady gaze upon a thing,' for this among the ancients, curious as it may seem to us, was not the outcome of 'extremus metus,' but of indomitable courage. Cf. e.g. *Hor.* C. I 3,18 qui siccis oculis monstra natantia, qui vidit mare turgidum and Postgate's note to Prop. II. 27, 7. If *aciem* must therefore, be considered out of place, probably due to a gloss on *corpora*, this latter must not be molested, and all that is required to restore the passage is to read 'extremus metus,' the 's' being omitted, because of the similarity of the following letter, which error in turn very naturally drew along with it the change of 'extremus' to 'extremo.' This emendation seems to me in every way more methodical than to delete 'et' with Wex and others; in fact the presence of the conjunction clearly points to a nominative following. I, therefore, write: 'novissimae res et extremus metus corpora defixere in his vestigiis.'[1] This reading, it may be remarked in passing, is also more in conformity with the laws of prose rhythm which Tacitus, closely following Cicero's Orator and Quintilian, has imposed upon himself, an observation which I hope to establish in detail elsewhere, for the 'numerus Taciteus' seems not hitherto to have been made a subject of investigation.

Agr. 38,16: ipse peditem atque equites . . . in hibernis locavit,

Read: 'pedites atque equites' or 'peditem atque equitem,' for, fond as Tacitus admittedly is of inconcinnity of collocation, he never, in *all the* 30 *instances* of 'pedes' and 'eques' found in his writings, varies the number, except when these words occur in adversative clauses or when in different syntactical relation. When closely joined by a copulative conjunction, they occur either both in the collective singular (7 times) or both in the plural (14 times).

Agr. 43, 13: speciem tamen doloris animo vultuque prae se tulit.

That *animo* cannot well be correct is all but universally conceded,[2] but the emendations hitherto suggested possess no intrinsic probability, e.g. 'mimo, amictu, ore, sermone' and this is preeminently true of the generally accepted correction of *Ernesti*, who writes *habitu* for *animo*, chiefly, it would seem, because 'habitus' and 'vultus' are not infrequently combined. I have not the slightest doubt that Tacitus wrote: 'speciem doloris *animi* vultu prae se tulit.' The change is simplicity itself, for the *que* was naturally added when 'animi' had become 'animo,'

[1] This note had long been written, when I found that *Constans*, Rev. de phil. XXI. p. 29 had advocated the same reading, but he gives no grounds for his opinion.

[2] Cf. esp. *Woelfflin*, Phil. XXVI. p. 154.

though it is also quite possible that *que* is nothing more than a dittography of p̃r (prae). With the phrase, cp. *Cic.* in Verr. I 8,21 cupiebam animi dolorem vultu tegere, pro Sest. 41,88 dolorem animi and especially the remarkable parallel in *Curt.* VI 9,1 (32) *vultu praeferens dolorem animi.*

Agr. 44, 11 ff.: Et ipse quidem, quamquam medio in spatio integrae aetatis ereptus, quantum ad gloriam, longissimum aevum peregit: Quippe et vera bona quae in virtutibus sita sunt et consulari ac triumphalibus ornamentis praedito, quid aliud adstruere fortuna poterat? Opibus nimiis non gaudebat: speciosae non contigerant filia atque uxore superstitibus: Potest videri etiam beatus, incolumi dignitate, florente fama, salvis affinitatibus et amicitiis futura effugisse.

This is the reading of our two MSS., but Tacitus cannot have written the passage as it stands. One difficulty has, indeed, long been noticed and many attempts have been made to do away with it, but all were necessarily doomed to failure for reasons which will appear later. Another difficulty, though no less perplexing, has never been felt. I turn to the latter first.

In the first place, I ask, what is the *antecedent* of 'quippe'?[1] The answer probably would be '*quantum ad gloriam*,' but that is impossible for several reasons. To begin with, this phrase is only thrown in as *parenthesis.* A second far more serious objection is, that the constituent elements which secured such *gloria*[2] to Agricola are enumerated in the very clause introduced by way of contrast to something that preceded, and significantly joined with 'vera bona' by 'et...et.' Again, no *bona*, to which the *vera bona* might be opposed, had been previously mentioned. But if so, then both *quippe* and *vera bona* hang completely in the air, *gloriam* being out of the question, as involving no antithesis. Now this difficulty is removed, if we suppose that the archetypon had: *peregit. Opibus nimiis non gaudebat speciosae non contigerant.* Quippe et vera bona etc.' The eye of the copyist passed from OPB to QPP, but noticing his oversight too late for immediate correction, he inserted the omitted *κῶλον*, when he reached the presumable end of the sentence at 'poterat.' With this emendation, all the difficulty disappears: 'He did not take delight in excessive riches and, as a matter of fact, resplendent or showy (*speciosus* is an extremely strong word) wealth did not fall to his lot, but, of course, that did not sour a man of Agricola's nature (quippe = enim, with the usual ellipsis to be supplied in thought), for both the true blessings which consist in virtue and the highest political honours had been his etc.'

This is good Stoic doctrine. The wise and, therefore, virtuous man, is both *dives* and *rex*, even without actually possessing material wealth or royal power.

Having thus restored what, I feel convinced, every unprejudiced reader will regard as the meaning of the author, I proceed to discuss the other crux referred to above. It turns upon the words 'filia...superstitibus,' and I confess to having been not a little surprised to find, that the very *transposition* which had been advocated on internal grounds alone and quite independent of any bearing it might have upon the present problem, also furnished the key to its solution.

The MSS., it must be observed, make no stop till *potest*, joining *filia atque uxore superstitibus* closely with *contigerant*, a collocation quite impossible. *Wex* tried to get over the difficulty by reading 'speciosae contigerant filiae atque uxori superstitibus.' As this had absolutely nothing in its favour, editors were driven nolentes volentes, to take the ablative absolute with the 'potest' clause, but this involved them in other difficulties, from which they endeavoured to extricate themselves in various ways.

Doederlein and *Urlichs* rightly felt that if this clause is to go with what follows, it ought not to be separated from the other ablatives and, accordingly, the former boldly placed it after *fama*, the latter after *amicitiis*, thus securing an admirable climax; but neither took the trouble to explain the curious dislocation, and their suggestions in consequence were rejected. Another editor, thereupon, in his perplexity maintained that the separation of these ablatives was due to the fact that the 'filia etc.' clause was an ablative of *cause*, explaining *beatus*, while the others were ablatives of *quality*; forgetting, of course, that this alleged separation is not confirmed by the MSS. But the climax is reached by *Peter* who, in all seriousness, asserts that we have here nothing more than a harsh Tacitean ellipsis, the sentence in full being: 'filia...superstitibus, potest... beatus<excessisse>...effugiens'! This ab-

[1] Synonymous, as often in Tacitus, with *enim*, which could not have been used here for obvious reasons.

[2] It may be noted in passing that the Stoics, whose doctrines are clearly here hinted at, probably did not reckon 'glory' as among the *mala* or *ἀδιάφορα*, for, as Cicero facetiously remarked (pro Arch. 11,26), they never fail to put their names to their treatises 'de gloria contemnenda.'

surdity is not only accepted by *Andresen*, but the author of the 'De verborum apud Tacitum collocatione' adds that the words 'filia...superstitibus' are placed at the beginning and separated from their fellows, 'quod illis maiorem tribuebat gravitatem!'

But the ablative absolute under discussion cannot be taken with the 'potest' clause under any circumstances, and that chiefly for two reasons, not to lay too much stress upon the testimony of MSS. in matters of punctuation. One of these had long ago been pointed out by *Selling* and *Wex*, but their argument has been hitherto wholly ignored. It is the simple observation, that Tacitus could never have said that Agricola, while still *living*, was happy, because his child and wife *survived* him. We expect at least 'etiam tum vivis.' 'Nam superstites is demum habet qui mortuus est, non qui moriturus' (Wex p. 98). Beside, asked Selling, would Agricola have been less happy in escaping the evil days to come, if his wife and child had not survived?

In the second place, the very position of *potest*, separated by a considerable interval from its verb *effugisse* at the end of the sentence, is a clear proof, that it was intended to open the sentence, for this is one of the most characteristic features of the 'collocatio verborum Tacitea.' Out of the *thirty* instances, given in the Lex. Tac., s.v. possum (p. 1141), fifteen of which Andresen himself enumerates l.c. p. 2, it will be sufficient to cite: Agr. 42 *posse* etiam sub malis principibus bonos viros *esse*.

But if 'filia...superstitibus' can neither be joined to *contigerant* nor with *potest*, what becomes of it? The transposition above advocated disposes of this dilemma. In the original text, the above clause followed *poterat*, where it fits in most admirably, the ablative absolute at the end of a 'clausula' being, moreover, of very frequent occurrence in Tacitus, and particularly so in the *Agricola*. Cp. *Dial.* 1, 19 *G.* 28, 9. 41, 8. 46, 11 and *Agr.* 2, 12. 7, 8. 9, 25. 14, 4. 15, 12. 22, 2. 23, 6. 30, 5.

We come to the last point to be discussed in this passage, for hitherto the *non* before 'contigerant' has been tacitly accepted as given by both MSS., although modern editors delete it, chiefly on the basis of a marginal note in A.[1] But these glosses have no MS. authority whatsoever; they are simply the conjectures of Pomponius Laetus and very poor ones at that. In the passage before us, his critical contribution has been particularly unfortunate, for we have the very strongest reasons for the retention of the *negative*.

In the first place, the deletion of *non* would make Tacitus flatly contradict *Cass. Dio* LXVI., 20, the one other extant writer to mention Agricola at all and from *independent* sources at that. Now making all due allowance for overstatement or exaggerated expression, there can be no doubt that Dio was well informed, when he said l.c. ὁ δὲ Ἀγρικόλας ἐν τε ἀτιμία τὸ λοιπὸν τοῦ βίου καὶ ἐνδεία...ἔζησεν, and yet Peerlkamp does not shrink from emending the Greek text to bring it into harmony with a purely conjectural reading in the Latin!

But apart from the testimony of the MSS. and Cassius Dio, there are also strong *internal* grounds in favour of *non*. For everything that we gather from the biography itself concerning Agricola's personal estate proves him not to have had 'opes *speciosas*.' Thus, we learn that he lost his patrimony[2]; that Caligula confiscated the fortune of Agricola's father after his execution is also highly probable.[3]

Finally Tacitus' repeated references to his scrupulous honesty, his refusal to connive at rascality or share in the time-honoured practice of extortion, his conduct as praetor (c. 6) and the very mention of his not receiving the 'salarium proconsulare'—all point to the fact that Agricola was *not* a *very wealthy* man. Last, but not least, it is very difficult to believe that Tacitus could ever have made the gratuitous and vapid remark which the editors attribute to him: 'Excessive riches had no charms for him, but such fell to his lot.' How appropriate and significant on the other hand, in a 'liber honori soceri mei destinatus' the statement becomes, if we retain the *non* of the MSS., will be clear from the paraphrase given above. The whole passage, as emended, will, therefore, read thus:

'Ipse quidem...peregit. *Opibus nimiis non gaudebat, speciosae non contigerant.* Quippe et vera bona...et consulari...praedito, quid aliud adstruere fortuna poterat, filia atque uxore superstitibus? Potest videri etiam beatus...effugisse.

Agr. 45, 5: una adhuc victoria Carus Metius censebatur et intra Albanam arcem sententia Messalini strepebat et Massa Baebius *iam tum* reus erat.

Iam is omitted in B and hence the great

[1] Cf. *Heller*, Philol. LI. pp. 340 ff., retains the *non*, but his treatment does not touch the points at issue.

[2] Cp. 7 magnam patrimonii partem diripuit (sc. classis Othoniana).

[3] Cp. 4 and *Urlichs*, De vita et honoribus Agricolae p. 8.

majority of editors felt justified in bracketing the word, *Gronovius* suggesting *etiam* as an alternative, as if these changes did away with the difficulty, for Tacitus in any case is made to interrupt his enumeration of the *evils*, which Agricola happily did not live to see, by an incident which could not but have been a cause for rejoicing and gratification; for this notorious informer had been, as early as the days of Claudius, to use Tacitus' own words in H. IV. 50: optimo cuique exitiosus et inter causas malorum quae mox tulimus, saepius rediturus.' The inconsistency here pointed out is easily disposed of by reading *nondum* for 'iam tum.' Just as *Metius* and *Messalinus* had not yet revealed all the cruelty and rascality of which they were capable, so *Baebius Massa* seems to have kept his well-known evil propensities in check for a while; at the present time he had not yet committed any misdeeds of sufficient enormity to result in an impeachment. But this occurred, as we happen to know, in the year of Agricola's death and resulted in his conviction. Agricola was, therefore, fortunate in not witnessing the reappearance of this rascal, particularly as his condemnation seems not materially to have weakened his power ('saepius rediturus').

Agr. 46, 7: admiratione te potius et immortalibus laudibus et, si natura suppeditet, similitudine colamus.

Nearly all editors have followed *Muretus* in reading *colamus* for *decoramus* of the MSS. 'Decoremus' (Ursinus) may possibly be defended in view of the well-known line from Ennius 'nemo me dacrumis decoret.' But if *colamus* is to be substituted as being somehow more suitable to the simple pathos of this wonderful epilogue, we should at least read: 'admiratione potius...te colamus.' Not only does *te* thus receive its proper emphasis by position, making a 'dichoreic' clausula, but the *decoramus*, if it be corrupt, is thus most plausibly accounted for, J. Müller's explanation that *de* was due to the last syllable of an abbreviated 'similitudine' (similitude) being impossible, because that word is itself but an emendation of *Grotius*, the MSS. having 'militum' or 'multum.'

Alfred Gudeman.

Philadelphia, *Jan.* 1897.

THE MINOR WORKS OF XENOPHON.

(*Continued from p.* 237.)

VIII. The Agesilaus.

Since Valckenaer first expressed an opinion that the *Agesilaus* was not the work of Xenophon, its authenticity has been much discussed. Perhaps the chief argument on one side has been the style. Critics have said with some reason that in places it reminded them less of X. than of Isocrates. But, just as with the two *Constitutions*, no one that I know of has gone carefully enough through the vocabulary and syntax of the book, comparing them with what we know of X.'s usual way of writing. They have indeed received much less attention than the language of the *Constitutions*, and a few detached remarks are all that seem to have been made on the subject. I will endeavour to examine them somewhat more systematically, though of course not exhaustively.

For our purpose it will be well to divide the book into three parts. The first two chapters are largely, though not entirely, made up of passages taken from the *Hellenics* or at least agreeing more or less *verbatim* with passages in the *Hellenics;* and, so far as this agreement goes, the style, vocabulary, etc. cannot be used as an argument. These two chapters, therefore, which are yet highly deserving of our attention, I will reserve to the end, taking first chapters 3-10, and then separately chapter 11, the authenticity of which has been more particularly doubted.

In chapters 3-10 we find again a few of the words we have already noticed as Xenophontean. Ὡς = ὥστε with indicative occurs in 3, 2 (οὕτως ἐσέβετο...ὡς...ἐνόμιζον); ἔνθα 'where' occurs 5, 7: 6, 2: 10, 1; τέκνα 3, 3; πάμπαν 5, 3; μεῖον 6, 3 and μειονεκτεῖν 4, 5: 7, 2; εὐφροσύνη 9, 4. But there are very many more of the same kind to be added. I will take the chapters *seriatim* Λάφυρα is a tragic word unknown to Attic prose, but X. uses it in *Hell.* 5, 1, 24, and either λάφυρα πωλεῖν or λαφυροπωλεῖν in *Anab.* 6, 6, 38: it is used here in 4, 6. In the words ὅστις δ' ἥρεῖτο καὶ σὺν τῷ γενναίῳ μειονεκτεῖν ἢ σὺν τῷ ἀδίκῳ πλέον ἔχειν (4, 5) we have language doubly characteristic of X., for it is his way not only to use σύν (so

σὺν Ἀγησιλάῳ in 3, 4) where most prose writers use μετά, but to combine it with certain substantives or quasi-substantives so as to produce a sort of adverbial expression. In poetry we find σὺν δίκῃ, etc.: in prose it is X. who gives us such phrases as σὺν τῷ καλῷ (*Cyr.* 8, 1, 32): σὺν τῷ δικαίῳ καὶ καλῷ (*Anab.* 2, 6, 18): οὐδαμῶς σὺν τῇ βίᾳ ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον σὺν τῇ εὐεργεσίᾳ (*Cyr.* 8, 7, 13): σὺν τῷ σῷ ἀγαθῷ (*ib.* 3, 1, 15): σὺν κραυγῇ, σὺν γέλωτι, etc. Πῇ (4, 3 πῇ ἄν τις αὐτὸν εἰκότως αἰτιάσαιτο;) is common in X. and Plato, very little used I think by the orators. Demosthenes has it once only, and that in almost his earliest speech (29, 1). Θοίνη is another word not used, as far as we can tell, in ordinary Attic, though Plato has it eight or ten times. It occurs in *Cyr.* 4, 2, 39 and here in 5, 1: also θοινάζω in 8, 7 (θοινατικός *Oec.* 9, 7). Μόχθος and μοχθεῖν do not occur at all in the orators. Aristophanes uses the verb three or four times in the *Plutus* only, and always in anapaests or trochaics; the substantive in some burlesque anapaests in *Thesm.* 780. The words do not seem to be used at all by Plato. On the other hand X. uses the noun twice in the *Symposium* and the verb half a dozen times in various places. The verb occurs here in 5, 3. Ἀνὰ κράτος is another Xn. expression not shared by Plato, who uses the more Attic κατὰ κράτος: it occurs here in 5, 4: 8, 3. X. often uses ἀντίος where more Attic writers use ἐναντίος: so here in 5, 7 we have ἀντία τῆς Ἑλλάδος = ἐναντίον τῆς Ἑλλάδος. Ἀγάλλεσθαι is unknown to Aristophanes and the orators: Thucydides has it half a dozen times, Plato once or twice, X. in at least a dozen places. It is used here three times (5, 3: 9, 1 and 4).

The use of θυμῷ 'with spirit' as in θυμῷ μάχεσθαι (6, 2) may be found once or twice in Thucydides and in *Cyr.* 4, 2, 21 ἴωμεν ῥώμῃ καὶ θυμῷ ἐπὶ τοὺς πολεμίους, but it must be very uncommon. The frequent use of θυμῷ = ὀργῇ, as in τὰ θυμῷ πραχθέντα, in the ninth book of Plato's *Laws* is similar, but not quite identical. Παρέχειν, used as in 6, 4 τοὺς δὲ στρατιώτας ἅμα πειθομένους καὶ φιλοῦντας αὐτὸν παρεῖχε, where it simply means 'make so and so,' 'put into a certain condition,' is very characteristic of X. (see the index in Holden's *Oeconomicus*), and the way in which it is followed by εἶχε in the next sentence, τούς γε μὴν πολεμίους εἶχε ψέγειν μὲν οὐ δυναμένους κ.τ.λ., corresponds curiously to a passage in *Oec.* 21, 4–5. On ὅπου τάχους δέοι (6, 5) we may remark that X. always uses τάχος, never ταχυτής, and on λήθων in the same §, that λήθω as a by-form of λανθάνω is found in a few passages (*Oec.* 7, 31: *Symp.* 4, 48) of X. alone among Attic prose writers. The phrase νυκτὶ ὥσαπερ ἡμέρᾳ χρῆσθαι, which on *R.L.* 5, 7 we saw to be Xn., occurs again here in 6, 6. With regard to 6, 7 συντεταγμένον οὕτως...ὡς ἂν ἐπικουρεῖν μάλιστα ἑαυτῷ δύναιτο see the remarks on ὡς ἄν in Goodwin *M. and T.* App. 4, 1 (*b*): ἐπικουρῶ we saw on *R.L.* 2, 6 to be Xn. Ἀτρεμής and kindred words occur very seldom in Attic prose, though they are found. X. has ἀτρεμές ὄμμα in *Symp.* 8, 3: ἀτρεμία *Cyr.* 6, 3, 13. Ἄτρεμας occurs a few times in the doubtful *Cynegeticus*. Here we have τὸ ἀτρεμές in 6, 7. Ῥώμη used (6, 8) of courage may be compared with *Hell.* 7, 5, 23 where ῥώμη is opposed to ἀθυμία. Ὠφέλημα is a word of the poets, not to be found in orators or Plato, but we have it in *Hiero* 10, 3 and here in 7, 2. Ἡρεμεῖν, not in Thucydides, comedy, or orators, but Platonic, is used three or four times by X. and here in 7, 3. Δωρεῖσθαι (7, 7) is a favourite word with X. and Plato, but hardly used in comedy or oratory. On the exceptional use of ὡς in an 'object sentence' (7, 7 ἐπεμελήθη ἢ ὅπως... ἢ ὅπως...ἢ ὡς κ.τ.λ.) see Goodwin *u. s.* p. 402. Φιλόστοργος (8, 1) and μεγαληγορεῖν (8, 2) can be paralleled in the same and kindred forms from X., but hardly from any other good prose writer. With μεγαλογνωμοσύνη (8, 3) and μεγαλογνώμων (9, 6) cf. μεγαλογνώμων in *Oec.* 21, 8: the word is very rare. Τεχνᾶσθαι (9, 3) is scarcely used by the orators, Plato, or comedy (see, however, Ar. *Vesp.* 176), but occasionally by X. Μαστεύω (9, 3) = ζητῶ is a word characteristic of X., not used in pure prose. In 9, 3 we have also κοιμᾶσθαι, equally poetic and equally Xn. Τέρπειν, a word avoided by the orators but used two or three times, as also is τερπνός, by X., will be found in 9, 4. The use of ἀνά in 9, 7 ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν is not found, I fancy, in the best Attic prose, but there are many examples of it in X. Ἀλκή (10, 1) is used three or four times by X., who is also fond of ἄλκιμος: it occurs now and then in Thucydides, not in oratory, comedy, or even Plato. In 10, 4 we have μήκιστος, not found in pure prose but used *Cyr.* 4, 5, 28: we have seen before that X. also uses μάσσων.

The use of particles in these chapters is, as far as I can judge, quite Xn., though Roquette (*De X. Vita* p. 40) lays stress on the disproportionate use of τοιγαροῦν in *Ages.* (five times out of a total of nineteen), and though I do not notice a καί-δέ anywhere. The writer, too, pays no more attention than X. to the occurrence of hiatus.

Chapter 11 is certainly, in style, more full

of antitheses and other Isocratean turns of expression than we are accustomed to find in X. It is therefore a matter of particular interest to see whether the vocabulary is Xn. or no. I find in the first sentence his characteristic ὡς final and in the concluding sentence of the book his equally characteristic ὡς for ὥστε. Πάμπαν occurs again 11, 4: μήκιστον again 11, 15. The above-mentioned use of σύν is illustrated in 11, 11 by τῷ μεγαλόφρονι οὐ σὺν ὕβρει ἀλλὰ σὺν γνώμῃ ἐχρῆτο. Ἀρεστός (11, 5) used once by Lysias alone of the orators (Isocrates has δυσάρεστος twice), is rather a favourite word with X. The form στερίσκω (11, 5) is used once or twice by X., once apparently by Plato, more often by Thucydides, hardly by orators or comic poets. Διαπονεῖν, -εῖσθαι (11, 7) are often found in X. and Plato, not often elsewhere. Characteristic of them both is also the extended use of ἐρᾶν as in 11, 9 δόξης οὐδεμίας ἤρα: cf. 3, 1. Ἀμαυροῦν (11, 12) is a poetical word (occurring, as does ἀμαυρός, as a matter-of-fact *vocabulum artis* in the doubtful *Cynegeticus*) that does not surprise us in X. Ἀγήρατος (11, 14) is found in *Cyr.* 8, 7, 22: *Mem.* 4, 3, 13. We have had occasion before, in speaking of the *R.L.*, to observe that μεγαλεῖος, ῥᾳδιουργία and καλοκἀγαθία (11, 6 and 16) were favourite words with X. I think the same may be said of ἐκπονεῖν (11, 9) and of διαγίγνεσθαι with a participle (11, 16). Lastly we may notice as before the Xn. use of ἀνά in ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν (11, 16), and the Xn. ἀμφί (11, 11) for the more Attic περί. In the use of particles there seems to be nothing noticeable about this chapter, unless it be the somewhat clumsy frequency of γε μήν. Hiatus occurs very little in the earlier part, more often in the later. Thus we find τῷ μὲν δικαίῳ ἀρκεῖν ἡγούμενος τὸ ἐᾶν τἀλλότρια (8): τὸ εὔχαρι οὐ σκώμμασιν,...τῷ μεγαλόφρονι οὐ σὺν ὕβρει ἀλλὰ σὺν γνώμῃ ἐχρῆτο (11): τῇ πατρίδι ὠφέλιμος and τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ἀρετῆς (16). These things are worth noticing, because a *scriptor in schola quadam Isocratea eruditus* and producing *ex Isocratea officina profectas sententias* (Hartman in *Analecta Xenophontea*) was comparatively unlikely to let them pass.

I turn back now to the narrative part of the book, the first two chapters, which go over the same ground as portions of the *Hellenics* and have whole passages in common with it. I shall ignore such words as are found in the corresponding passages of the *Hellenics* and notice some which belong to the *Agesilaus* only.

X., like Plato, makes much freer use of ἐγχειρεῖν as an equivalent for ἐπιχειρεῖν than the orators do. We find in 1, 1 ὅμως δ' ἐγχειρητέον. Μείων is used several times (1, 1 and 13: 2, 1, etc.). The aorist ὠρέχθην is quoted from no prose writer but X. (*Mem.* 1, 2, 16: *Symp.* 8, 35), for in Isocr. *Ep.* 6, 9 ὀριγνηθῆναι seems the better reading (Blass): we have it here in 1, 4. In the same section and again in 1, 26: 2, 7 we have the double τε (=τε—καί), rare in prose but sometimes used by X. [We have three instances in these chapters (1, 8, perhaps not certain: 2, 6 and 31) of a single τε used to attach a sentence or clause to something preceding: this is also used by X., but it occurs now and then in almost every writer.] Ἐρίζω (1, 5) is a poetical word used by Plato and once or twice by X. The temporal use of ἐπεί, which we noticed in *R.L.* as characteristic of X. and Thucydides, occurs in 1, 5 and many other passages of these two narrative chapters. Καταδηλος (1, 6) is used occasionally by X. and Plato, apparently only once or twice in an orator (Isocrates). Πρόσθεν we saw before to be very common in X. in place of the more ordinary Attic ἔμπροσθεν: it occurs here (1, 8, etc.) some half-dozen times. In 1, 18 see as to λαφυροπωλεῖν the remark above on λάφυρα in 4, 6, and notice that προτελεῖν is found *Anab.* 7, 7, 25: *Vect.* 3, 9, probably not elsewhere in the best Greek. The words in 1, 19 ὁπότε αὐτόμολοι...χρήματα ἐθέλοιεν ὑφηγεῖσθαι seem a clear case of ἐθέλω=βούλομαι, wish, not mere willingness. This is extremely rare in Attic prose, except in a few set phrases such as ὁ ἐθέλων, ὅν ἂν ἐθέλῃ, ἂν ὁ θεὸς θέλῃ. Whether a clear case can be found in X.'s undoubted writings, I do not know: but, like Plato, he is just such a writer as we should expect to use it occasionally. With the phrase χρήματα ὑφηγεῖσθαι may be compared ἀγαθὰ ὑφηγεῖσθαι in *Cyr.* 8, 7, 15. We have also in 1, 19 the first of four examples contained in these two chapters of X.'s special use of ὡς with 'object clauses' (see on 7, 7 above and cf. 1, 22: 2, 1 and 31 for the other examples): ἐπεμέλετο ὡς διὰ τῶν φίλων ἁλίσκοιτο. The poetical ἀέναος (1, 20) is found in *Cyr.* 4, 2, 44. Ὡς final occurs 1, 23: ἔδοξεν αὐτῷ ἱππικὸν κατασκευαστέον εἶναι, ὡς μὴ δραπετεύοντα πολεμεῖν δέοι αὐτόν. It is probably by an oversight that Goodwin ranks this as an 'object clause.' Another example occurs in 2, 8 ὡς ἱκανοὶ εἶεν. Ἀνὰ τὰ πεδία (1, 23) and ἀνὰ τὰ ὄρη (2, 22) is the Xn. use noticed above. Ἀγαστῶς (1, 24) seems unique, but X. four times uses ἀγαστός and Plato is perhaps the only other good prose writer who employs it. Ῥώμη is used of courage in 1, 28 as in 6, 8. Ἀποθύω

(1, 34) occurs twice in *Anab.*: ὁμονόως (1, 37) in *Cyr.* 6, 4, 15: ἐθελούσιος (1, 38) several times in *Cyr.*

The first section of ch. 2 gives us στόλος, a historian's word very rare in the orators. In 2, 6 στράτευμα...ἠγάγετο may be compared with *Anab.* 1, 10, 17: *Cyr.* 5, 4, 39. We find ὡς = ὥστε in 2, 7. For καὶ μέντοι (2, 9) cf. index to Holden's *Oeconomicus.* Μετὰ χεῖρας (2, 14) is an old or hardly Attic phrase (Thuc. 1, 138, 4: Herod. 7, 16) which causes us no surprise in X. Εὐπετής (2, 18 εὐπετῶς) though rare in the orators, is a favourite word with X. Πασσυδίᾳ (2, 19) or πασσυδί may be found in *Hell.* 4, 4, 9: Thuc. 8, 1, 1: and in poetry. Πῃ (2, 21) like πῇ (4, 3) belongs to X. and Plato, occurring very seldom in oratory or comedy. Κατακαίνω (2, 22 and 23) is a form used by poets and by X. The plural verb in σφάλματα ἐγένοντο (2, 23) is much more in X.'s way than in that of any other Attic prose writer. Σύν is used in 23 and 24, perhaps elsewhere. Τῷ παντί with πλέον and with κρατεῖν (2, 24) is also Xn., and εὔρωστος (*ibid.*) is a word used two or three times by him. Finally we may notice one of the rare points of syntax as distinguished from vocabulary in which X. seems to depart from the Attic rule. For the imperfect in 2, 28 ἅσμενος ἤκουσεν ὅτι μετεπέμπετο αὐτόν we should ordinarily have μεταπέμπεται or μεταπέμποιτο. It is known that X. often in *oratio obliqua* uses this imperfect to represent the present of the *recta*, and a list of many examples will be found in Joost's book on the *Anabasis*, p. 199. A less clear case occurs in 1, 38 ἐδήλωσαν ὅτι οὐ πλαστὴν τὴν φιλίαν παρείχοντο, where the imperfect may refer to a time previous to ἐδήλωσαν, and another quite clear one outside these two chapters in 3, 3 εἰδὼς ὅτι Φαρνάβαζος γῆμαι μὲν τὴν βασιλέως ἔπραττε θυγατέρα, τὴν δ' αὐτοῦ ἄνευ γάμου λαβεῖν ἐβούλετο...Ἀγησιλάῳ ἑαυτὸν...ἐνεχείρισε.

A few words in these chapters seem to deserve special mention. Three or four times where a passage in *Ages.* is practically the same as one in *Hell.*, we find a difference in one particular word, and the word used in *Ages.* is more markedly Xn. than that used in *Hell.* Thus *Hell.* 3, 4, 11 has ἐλάττονα, while *Ages.* 1, 13 has μείονα: *Hell.* 3. 4, 15 has κατὰ τὰ πεδία, *Ages.* 1, 23 ἀνὰ τὰ πεδία (cf. the variation in Eur. *Med.* 509): *Hell.* ibid. προθύμως ζητοίη, *Ages.* 1, 24 προθύμως μαστεύοι: *Hell.* 4, 3, 20 ἡ νίκη Ἀγησιλάου ἐγεγένητο, *Ages.* 2, 13 ἡ νίκη σὺν Ἀγησιλάῳ ἐγένετο: *Hell.* 4, 5, 1 βοσκήματα, *Ages.* 2, 18 κτήνη, a word used pretty often by X. but not in pure Attic prose: *Hell.* 4, 3, 6 τοὺς περὶ αὐτόν, *Ages.* 2, 3 τοὺς ἀμφ' αὐτόν, and so in *Hell.* 4, 3, 17 as compared with *Ages.* 2, 11. In *Hell.* 3, 4, 15 μαστεύοι has been actually restored to the text by conjecture, founded on the *Ages.*, that ζητοίη is only a gloss on the rarer word, and possibly it may be thought that similar changes should be made elsewhere. But in any case it is undeniable that in these instances—and there may be more of them—the more characteristic Xn. expression appears in the *Agesilaus.* A somewhat similar, yet not the same, occurrence may be observed in 2, 13-14. There are various details added here, to which nothing in *Hell.* exactly corresponds, and the sentences peculiar to *Ages.* contain the very Xn. words ἔστε = ἕως and ἔνθα = οὗ or ἵνα. They contain also κολεός, which seems to occur in no prose writer but X., and χαμαί, which is very rare out of poetry but used *Hell.* 4, 1, 30.

Now that we have gone through the *Agesilaus* and ascertained what a large number of expressions it has throughout which belong distinctly to the idiom of X., it will be proper to see what evidence, if any, of a like nature can be adduced on the other side. We shall think very little of occasional ἅπαξ εἰρημένα in the way of adjectives and even of substantives and verbs, unless there is some special reason for doing so, because the various works of one author constantly exhibit this small diversity. There is no work of X., as there is no book of Thucydides and I daresay few dialogues of Plato, in which noticeable words do not occur that are not elsewhere used by the author. Such adjectives therefore as ἀδιάσπαστος (1, 4), φρονηματίας (1, 24), πλαστός (1, 38), ἀνώχυρος (6, 6), πολυέραστος and πολυεπαίνετος (6, 8), μεγάλαυχος (8, 1) and ὑπέραυχος (11, 11), κρυψίνους (11, 5), εὐπαράπειστος (11, 12), μνήμων (11, 13), and γηραιός (11, 15) will not trouble us at all, especially as some of them, like so many of X.'s words, are known to us in the poets. Γεννικός (5, 4) is a doubtful emendation. There are two or three words which only occur in the disputed *Apologia*, and which cannot therefore be called certainly Xn.: εὐπάθεια 9, 3 and 11, 9: κακόδοξος 4, 1 (the *Apol.* has κακοδοξεῖν and κακοδοξία). Ἐξαμείβω (2, 2), ἀβρύνομαι (9, 2), ἐχθραίνω (11, 5), though poetical, cause us no surprise. Ἐξομιλεῖν (11, 4) is rare and only cited from Euripides: the poetical λατρεύω (7, 2) is found in *Cyr.* 3, 1, 36 in a literal sense. Ὀεπιτυχών = ὁ τυχών (1, 3) is not remarkable even if there is no other instance of it in X., nor is there anything very out-of-the-way in παντὰ τὰ αἰσχρὰ ἐξεδίωκεν (3, 1), if that reading is

right. Τὸ *παράπαν* (7, 7) is common enough, though X. seems not to have it elsewhere, but *ἀντίπροικα* (1, 18) is only quoted from Pollux. Τὸ *στόμα τοῦ βίου* (11, 15) is unique, if right. With *μισθὸν λύσει* in 2, 31, an unusual expression, cf. the words *ἧς αἱ πρόσοδοι λύουσι τἀναλώματα* in the fragment of Diphilus' Ἔμπορος given by Athenaeus 227 E. It may be observed that in *Mem.* 1, 2, 54 X. has the unusual expression *μισθὸν τίνειν*. A few points of syntax are just worth notice. There seems to be no precise parallel in X. to ἔρχομαι λέξων (2, 7), though *Anab.* 7, 7, 17 comes extremely close to it: but a construction that is used in Herodotus and Plato need not surprise us in X. The omission of *μᾶλλον* with *αἱρεῖσθαι...ἤ* (4, 5) may be the result of an accident, but the phrase is well established for good prose, even if undoubted writings of X. do not contain it. The construction of *πράττειν* in *γῆμαι τὴν βασιλέως ἔπραττε θυγατέρα* (3, 3) is unusual, but occurs in *Hell.* 6, 5, 6 *ἔπραττον ἐὰν κατὰ χώραν τὴν πόλιν*. For the infinitive in *οὐκ ἐκρατήθη οὔθ' ὑπὸ δώρων οὔθ' ὑπὸ τῆς βασιλέως ῥώμης ἐθελῆσαι ξενωθῆναι αὐτῷ* (8, 5) I do not find any precise parallel, but *μηχανᾶσθαι* with accusative and infinitive (6, 5) occurs *Hiero* 11, 4 and *Cyr.* 8, 2, 28 and 3, 1, and *ὑφιστάμενος πολεμεῖν* (6, 1) seems like *Cyr.* 6, 3, 35 *ὑφίσταμαι...τάξιν ἔχειν*. The use of *διαγίγνεσθαι* (1, 4) and *διατελεῖν* (10, 4) with an adjective alone can be illustrated from *Hell.* 2, 3, 25 : 4, 3, 3 : *Mem.* 1, 6, 2, etc.

The upshot of this tedious inquiry seems to be that all parts of the *Agesilaus* are full of characteristic Xn. words and that there is nowhere anything in the vocabulary or syntax that need raise the smallest doubt about the authorship. I know it may be said, and ought to be said, that in a minute verbal investigation like this the spirit of the writing is left out of account. The turn of the sentences is another thing from the vocabulary, another thing even from the syntax, and besides the turn of the sentences we have also the substance of the ideas themselves to consider. In this work, it is said, the turn of thought and expression is constantly different from the simplicity so characteristic of X. I am very much alive to this difference of spirit, which is indeed strongly marked ; but for settling questions of authorship I think small matters of language are much more important. A man is not bound always to write in one and the same style, and I see no reason why X. should not, especially in a panegyrical work, where more ornament was looked for, have tried to show what he could do in adopting a manner not usual with him. In the *Memorabilia* 2, 1 he makes some attempt at emulating the *μεγαλεῖα ῥήματα* (*ib.* 34) of Prodicus, for it is very improbable that he is just borrowing them, and the same thing may be seen in a less marked degree in other parts of his writings. Here in his old age he seems to have said to himself, like his own Socrates, *ἵνα καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν Γοργίειοις ῥήμασιν εἴπω* (*Symp.* 2, 26), but it must be owned that the result is not very successful. Plainness was his strength, and the ornamental parts of the *Agesilaus*, if not more empty than much of Isocrates, are not nearly so well turned as the periods of that skilful artist.

I add some suggestions on the text of the *Agesilaus*. Though by no means in a bad condition now, it is all the worse for the fact that it was neglected by Cobet, who dealt at considerable length in the *Novae Lectiones* with all the *opera minora* except this and the *Apologia Socratis*. In an incidental remark however (p. 233) he refers to it as Xenophon's, and probably this expresses his opinion as to the authorship.

1, 2. *τοῖς προγόνοις* (Ἀγησιλάου) *ὀνομαζομένοις ἀπομνημονεύεται ὁπόστος ἀφ' Ἡρακλέους ἐγένετο.*

No attempt to make sense of this can succeed, but it is not difficult to see what has happened. After *ὁπόστος* a very similar word has been accidentally omitted. Read *ὁπόστος <ἕκαστος> ἀφ' Ἡ. ἐγένετο.* 'It is always recorded for his various ancestors, when they are named, in what degree of descent from Heracles each stood.'

1, 3. *ὥσπερ τὸ γένος αὐτῶν τῆς πατρίδος ἐντιμότατον, οὕτω καὶ ἡ πόλις ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι ἐνδοξοτάτη.*

Τῆς πατρίδος ἐντιμότατον hardly seems grammar. Repeat a few letters so as to get *<τῶν> τῆς πατρίδος*, or read *τῶν* for *αὐτῶν*.

1, 6. *Ἀγησίλαος τοίνυν ἔτι μὲν νέος ὢν ἔτυχε τῆς βασιλείας· ἄρτι δ' ὄντος αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ, ἐξηγγέλθη βασιλεὺς ὁ Περσῶν ἀθροίζων καὶ ναυτικὸν καὶ πεζὸν πολὺ στράτευμα...βουλευομένων δὲ...Ἀγησίλαος ὑπέστη...διαβήσεσθαι εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν.*

As Agesilaus was now somewhat over forty years of age, scholars have been staggered at the statement that he was *ἔτι νέος*. This has even been adduced as evidence against X.'s authorship; but, as Mr. Dakyns remarks, (although he seems to think there is something in the argument), it would be equally surprising whoever said it. Should we not read *οὐκέτι μὲν νέος ὤν*? In the statement as it stands with its *μέν* and *δέ* there is no point. If A. had been

quite a young man, there might have been force in saying that he undertook the responsibility in spite of his youth, but in a man of forty this is ridiculous. What the writer means is that A., though no longer young and though quite new to power, had the enterprise to offer himself for an expedition against the Great King, and he goes on in the next sentence to say how people admired (*πάνυ ἠγάσθησαν*) his spirit in actually seeking the enemy out (*ἐπιόντα μᾶλλον ἢ ὑπομένοντα μάχεσθαι αὐτῷ*).

As for the insertion of a negative, many scholars hardly recognise how common a thing in MSS. the accidental omission and also in a less degree the insertion of a negative has been. I will quote only the instance of one book. Professor Lewis Campbell says 'logical confusions, especially between affirmative and negative, positive and privative, are peculiarly frequent in the text of Plato. *There are more than fifty instances of this form of error in the Republic:* mostly however among the later MSS.' (Jowett and Campbell's *Republic* ii. p. 106). Almost all our MSS. of X. are late.

1, 8. *πολλοὶ πάνυ ἠγάσθησαν αὐτὸ τοῦτο τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι κ.τ.λ.*

We shall restore the usual phrase, if we read *αὐτοῦ* for *αὐτό*. Cf. 2, 7 *ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον τάδ' αὐτοῦ ἄγαμαι, ὅτι κ.τ.λ.* : also 8, 4 and 6. But in view of § 9 *ἐπεί γε μὴν λαβὼν τὸ στράτευμα ἐξέπλευσε, κ.τ.λ.* I should prefer *ἠγάσθησαν <αὐτοῦ> αὐτὸ τοῦτο.*

1, 20. *ἡ...χώρα οὐκ ἂν δύναιτο πολὺν χρόνον στράτευμα φέρειν.*

For *φέρειν* read *τρέφειν*. (The two words occur together in § 21, where the meaning of *φέρειν* is different). I have suggested that the same error has crept into a line of Mimnermus (14, 11) *ὅτ' αὐγῇσιν φέρετ' ὠκέος ἠελίοιο.*

1, 27. Should the first *ὅπου* be *ὁπότε*? The mistake, if it is one, may have been due to the *ὅπου* just following.

Ibid. ὅπου γὰρ ἄνδρες θεοὺς μὲν σέβοιεν.

The parallel passage in *Hell.* has *σέβοιντο* and *Mem.* 4, 4, 19 is the only other passage where X. has the active. I should hesitate however to alter the more rare and poetical form. For *πειθαρχίαν* here *Hell.* by another variation has *πειθαρχεῖν*. In the next § the future *ἐμβαλεῖν* is perhaps shown to be right, as against *ἐμβάλλειν* in *Hell.*, by the future following a few lines later (*διοίσειν*), and *αὐτῷ* (*Ages.*) seems better than *οὕτω* (*Hell.*).

1, 28. *πίονας δὲ καὶ ἀπόνους διὰ τὸ ἀεὶ ἐπ' ὀχημάτων εἶναι.*

They did not spend all their time (*ἀεὶ εἶναι*) in carriages, but, when they travelled, they always went in them. Read *ἰέναι*. So Plato *Phaed.* 85 D *ἐπὶ βεβαιοτέρου ὀχήματος ...διαπορευθῆναι.*

1, 31. *παρήγγειλε δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἱππεῦσιν ἐμβάλλειν, ὡς αὐτοῦ τε καὶ παντὸς τοῦ στρατεύματος ἑπομένου.*

He said they *would* follow, *ἑψομένου*. Correct also *Hell.* 3, 4, 23.

1, 32. *καὶ οἱ μὲν πελτασταὶ ὥσπερ εἰκὸς ἐφ' ἁρπαγὴν ἐτρέποντο· ὁ δ' Ἀγησίλαος ἔχων κύκλῳ πάντα καὶ φίλια καὶ πολέμια περιεστρατοπεδεύσατο.*

Hell. has no *ἔχων*, and by itself it means nothing. Perhaps X. wrote *ἔχων <τοὺς ἄλλους>*, or *<τοὺς ἱππέας>* or something similar. The peltasts are contrasted with other troops.

1, 37. Probably some later hand has inserted the second *τὰς πόλεις* before *διατελέσαι.*

2, 1. Agesilaus made a forced march, *οὐ γὰρ ὡς ὑστερήσειε τῆς πατρίδος προὐθυμεῖτο.* We cannot take this in its literal meaning, for it would be a poor encomium to pass upon a hero, that he was not anxious to be too late to save his country. If therefore the text is right—and I see no reason for altering it—we must understand *οὐ προὐθυμεῖτο* to be just like our 'he did not want to be late,' meaning 'he wanted not to be late.' Besides the common *οὔ φημι, οὐκ ἀξιῶ*, we may compare *οὐ δοκῶ* 'seem not' (*e.g.* Ar. *Eq.* 1146 : *Peace* 1051), *οὐ προσποιοῦμαι* 'pretend not' (*e.g.* Thuc. 3, 47, 4 : [Dem.] *Phil.* 4, 60) *οὐ συμβουλεύω* 'advise not' (Herod. 7, 46, 1).

2, 2. *ἐκακούργουν οὗτοι ἐφεπόμενοι.*

Αὐτόν (*Hell.*) is clearly better than *οὗτοι*, which would naturally come before *ἐκακούργουν*, not after it. So is *ἐπ' οὐρᾷ ἔχων* than *ἐπ' οὐρὰν ἔχων*, which seems questionable. *Ἐπ' οὐράν* is rightly used with *παραπέμπων* just afterwards.

2, 7. *ὡς ἅπαντα μὲν χαλκόν, ἅπαντα δὲ φοινικᾶ φαίνεσθαι.*

χαλκόν must have a corresponding substantive. Read *φοινικίδα* (or *-ίδας*) with Schneider. Cf. *Cyr.* 6, 4, 1 *ἤστραπτε μὲν χαλκῷ, ἤνθει δὲ φοινικίσι πᾶσα ἡ στρατιά.*

2. 8. *ὡς πᾶσι πολλὰ κἀγαθὰ ἔσοιτο, εἰ ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ γίγνοιντο.*

Probably *γένοιντο*. He said *ἔσται, ἐὰν γένησθε.*

2, 13. *καίπερ πολλὰ τραύματα ἔχων πάντοσε καὶ παντοίοις ὅπλοις ὅμως οὐκ ἐπελάθετο τοῦ θείου.*

Hell. 4, 3, 20 has these words without *πάντοσε...ὅπλοις*, which by themselves are incomplete, like the *ἔχων* noticed in 1, 32. Plutarch *Ages.* 18 has *πολλας...δεξάμενον εἰς τὸ σῶμα πληγὰς δόρασι καὶ ξίφεσι.* I conjecture

that some participle should be added referring either to A. or his assailants (*e.g.* *ἐπικειμένων*) and that *πάντοσε* should be *πάντοθεν*.

4, 3. *τὸ δ', ὁπότε βούλοιτο εὖ ποιεῖν ἢ πόλιν ἢ φίλους χρήμασι, δύνασθαι παρ' ἑτέρων λαμβάνοντα ὠφελεῖν, οὐ καὶ τοῦτο μέγα τεκμήριον ἐγκρατείας χρημάτων;*

A man could hardly be said to prove his indifference to money by assisting country or friends for a consideration. This is another case of a missing negative. Read *<μηδὲν> παρ' ἑτέρων λαμβάνοντα*, and understand *δύνασθαι* of 'having the self-control,' 'having the high principle.' Somewhat similar is its use in 11, 10 *ἔν γε μὴν ταῖς εὐπραξίαις σωφρονεῖν ἐπιστάμενος ἐν τοῖς δεινοῖς εὐθαρσὴς ἐδύνατο εἶναι*. Cf. Virgil *Aen.* vii. 308 *nil linquere inausum quae potui infelix.*

6, 7. When exposed to attack from the enemy, A. would make his men march *ὥσπερ ἂν παρθένος ἡ σωφρονεστάτη, νομίζων ἐν τῷ τοιούτῳ τό τε ἀτρεμὲς καὶ ἀνεκπληκτότατον καὶ ἀθορυβητότατον καὶ ἀναμαρτητότατον καὶ δυσεπιβουλευτότατον εἶναι.*

At the head of these polysyllabic superlatives the little positive *ἀτρεμές* is a *παρθένος σωφρονεστάτη* indeed. What if we were to take away *τε*, which some one has inserted through misapprehension? Agesilaus thought that on such an occasion slow, orderly, quiet movement (*τὸ ἀτρεμές*) was the surest safeguard against panic, disorder, error, and stratagem.

7, 6. *μηχανὰς...αἷς πάντως ἤλπιζον ἑλεῖν τὰ τείχη.*

Ἄν should be added after or before *ἑλεῖν*. A simple aorist infinitive after *ἐλπίζω* is a solecism and may usually be turned into a future by the change of a letter or two, like aorists after *ὄμνυμι*.

7, 7. In *ἐπεμελήθη δέ τις ἄλλος* I would make the *τις* interrogative and not the verb. Cf. § 4 *τίνα τις εἶδεν ἄλλον στρατηγὸν κ.τ.λ.*

8, 1. *ᾧ γε ὑπαρχόυσης μὲν τιμῆς...τὸ μὲν μεγάλαυχον οὐκ ἄν εἶδε τις.*

Probably *<ἐν>εἶδε* should be read.

8, 8. *καλὸν δοκεῖ εἶναι τείχη ἀνάλωτα κτᾶσθαι ὑπὸ πολεμίων.*

For *κτᾶσθαι* read *ἵστασθαι*. The confusion of *κ* and *ισ* is well known, and these particular words are confused over and over again. *Κτᾶσθαι τείχη* seems to me a phrase that a Greek was not very likely to use, whereas *ἱστάναι τείχη* is known from Thuc. 1, 69, 1 *τὰ μακρὰ στῆσαι τείχη*: 1, 89, 4 *τοῦ περιβόλου βραχέα εἱστήκει*, etc. It is natural enough to use the middle, and X. constantly in *Hell.* has *τρόπαιον ἵστασθαι* for the common *τροπαῖον ἱστάναι*. So too, 6, 2 quoted below and again *ib.* 3.

The same mistake recurs, I think, in the last sentence of the book, *μνημεῖα μὲν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ἀρετῆς ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν κτησάμενος, τῆς δὲ βασιλικῆς ταφῆς ἐν τῇ πατρίδι τυχών.* When we remember such expressions as Thuc. 2, 41, 4 *πανταχοῦ μνημεῖα κακῶν τε καὶ ἀγαθῶν ἀΐδια ξυγκατοικίσαντες* and Lys. 10, 28 *μνημεῖα...ἀνάκειται* (of a real material *μνημεῖον*), we shall see that it ought to be *μνημεῖα...στησάμενος*. The *τυχών* which follows is not against this, but it may have helped the mistake. Cf. in 11, 7 *τοῦ μὲν σώματος εἰκόνα στήσασθαι ἀπείχετο*, and in 6, 2 *τρόπαιον ἐστήσατο, ἀθάνατα μὲν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ἀρετῆς μνημεῖα καταλιπών.*

9, 1. *ἀλλὰ μὴν ἐρῶ γε ὡς καὶ τὸν τρόπον ὑπεστήσατο τῇ τοῦ Πέρσου ἀλαζονείᾳ. πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ὁ μὲν..., Ἀγησίλαος δέ κ.τ.λ.*

There is no reason to think that *ὑφίσταμαι* can mean 'substitute' (Liddell and Scott). The meaning may be that he set up or established ways, habits, character for himself, which were a foundation (*ὑπό*) for his conduct; but I think this would be over-refining, and *ὑφίσταμαι* being frequently used in the sense of 'promising' or 'undertaking' (cf. 1, 7: 6, 1), I should suppose it to mean here that he took upon himself or adopted certain habits and principles. To find a construction for the dative we must add a word to which the general sense plainly points. Read *ὡς καὶ τὸν τρόπον ὑπεστήσατο <ἐναντίον> τῇ τοῦ Πέρσου ἀλαζονείᾳ*, unless we should substitute *ἐναντίον* for *καὶ τόν*.

9, 3. *ὅπως γε μὴν καταδάρθοι οὐδ' ἂν εἴποι τις ὅσα πραγματεύονται.*

The optative is ungrammatical. Either read *καταδάρθῃ*, or add *ἄν* as in the preceding sentence, *τί ἂν ἡδέως πίοι...τί ἂν ἡδέως φάγοι.* (Goodwin *M.* and *T.* p. 403).

9, 4. *ἠγάλλετο ὅτι αὐτὸς μὲν ἐν μέσαις ταῖς εὐφροσύναις ἀναστρέφοιτο, τὸν δὲ βάρβαρον ἑώρα, εἰ μέλλοι ἀλύπως βιώσεσθαι, συνελκυστέον αὐτῷ ἀπὸ περάτων τῆς γῆς τὰ τέρψοντα.*

The latter part of this is totally devoid of construction. Read *αὐτῷ* and add some such word as *ἡγούμενον* or *νομίζοντα*. He saw that the king thought he must gather together dainties from the ends of the earth. *Τέρψοντα <νομίζοντα>* is attractive, but the homoeteleuton is not needed to make the omission probable. Perhaps *συνελκυστέον αὐτῷ <εἶναι ἡγούμενον.>*

10, 3. *ἅπερ ζῶν ἤκουε, ταῦτα καὶ νῦν λέγεται περὶ αὐτοῦ.*

Perhaps *ταὐτά*, as *ὁ αὐτός* and *ὅσπερ* are regular correlatives. In 8, 7 *θεασάσθω δὲ τὰς θύρας αὐτοῦ· εἰκάσειε γὰρ ἄν τις ἔτι ταύτας ἐκείνας εἶναι ἅσπερ Ἀριστόδημος...ἐπεστήσατο.*

I suspect ταύτας should be τὰς αὐτάς or more probably αὐτάς.

11, 8. τῷ μὲν δικαίῳ ἀρκεῖν ἡγούμενος τὸ ἐᾶν τὰ ἀλλότρια, τῷ δ' ἐλευθερίῳ καὶ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ προσωφελητέον εἶναι.

Τῶν ἑαυτοῦ cannot be a partitive genitive. Such a genitive could only be used here after a verb usually taking an accusative, 'give (some) of his own money,' etc. It never occurs except as the object, if so it may be called, of such a transitive verb. It is clear that an ἀπό or ἐκ has been lost here. Probably καί stands for κἀκ.

11, 14. οὐκ ἀπεῖπε μεγάλην καὶ καλὴν ἐφιέμενος δόξαν.

The accusative after ἐφίεσθαι would be unique. Τοῦτ' ἐφίεσαι (Soph. *O.T.* 766: Linwood τοῦδ' ἐφίεσαι) is quite different by reason of τοῦτο being a neuter pronoun and = 'having this desire.' Perhaps Schneider is right in doubting ἐφιέμενος. Some change is indispensable.

11, 15. καίπερ ἤδη πρὸς τῷ στόματι τοῦ βίου ὤν.

X. uses στόμα in a peculiar way of the front ranks of an army, but neither that nor any other use of it seems exactly parallel to this. In *R.L.* 10, 1 we have ἐπὶ τῷ τέρματι τοῦ βίου, and possibly X. wrote that here, but I should hardly venture to substitute it.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

SABELLUS: SABINE OR SAMNITE?

IT is a curious fact that, in an age remarkable for the enormous advances which are being made in lexicography and the interpretation of the classical authors, our feeling for the meaning of any word should be getting blunted; but such seems to me to be the case in regard to the word *Sabellus*. Scholars of the 16th cent. (Lambinus, Lipsius, Cluver) and Niebuhr, seem to have been quite familiar with the fact that *Sabellus* may denote 'Samnite,' though they often hesitated as to the possibility of its also meaning 'Sabine.' But modern lexicographers and commentators seem to be gradually settling down to the idea that it always means 'Sabine'; Lewis and Short exclude 'Samnite' altogether, and commentators on Horace and Virgil posterior to Conington adopt the same attitude.[1] Yet I hope to show that in the large majority, at any rate, of the passages in which the word is found in the ordinary classical authors the meaning is 'Samnite' and not 'Sabine.' My argument has also an important bearing on the question of the nationality of Horace. I think it may be inferred from his use of the word *Sabellus* that he was of Samnite blood, perhaps belonging to a family which was enslaved during the Samnite wars. It may be replied, of course, that Samnite and Sabine are ultimately the same; that the Samnites were an offshoot of the Sabines of Sabina. Be this as it may—and I would leave the question to be settled by historians of Rome[2]—it does not affect my argument, which is that in current use the word *Sabelli* denoted to the Romans the offshoot and not the parent stock, or the offshoot *rather than* the parent stock. The evidence for this is to my mind so clear that I can only explain the statements of the lexicographers to the contrary by the supposition that they have been the victims of their philology; the connexion between *Sabellus* and *Sabinus* seemed to them obvious, and they did not see the still closer connexion between *Sabellus* and *Samnis* or *Samnitis* (= *Safnis*, *Safnitis*).[3]

But whether or no, it is impossible to dispose of the fact that there is no single passage in Horace or Virgil which demands the sense 'Sabine,' whereas there are many passages in these and other authors which either absolutely demand the sense 'Samnite' or on a fair interpretation make for that sense. Absolutely demanded it is in Livy viii. 1, 7 (dealing with the events of

[1] Thus, too, Sir E. H. Bunbury in the *Encycl. Brit.* (SABINES), vol. xxi. p. 129: '*Sabellus* is frequently found in Latin writers as an ethnic adjective equivalent to Sabine; but the practice adopted by modern writers of using it to denote all tribes of Sabine origin, including the Samnites, Lucanians, etc. was first introduced by Niebuhr and is not supported by any ancient authority.' The first part of this statement I consider wrong. *Ibid.* 'All readers of Horace must be familiar with his frequent allusions to the moral purity and frugal manners of the people that surrounded his *Sabine villa*.' The italics are mine and I venture to put a query to them.

[2] Prof. R. S. Conway informs me that the Sabine dialect may with certainty be inferred from the glosses that survive to have belonged to the Latin group, not to the Umbro-oscan group of dialects.

[3] '*Sabellus* would, I think, be a diminutive of a stem *Safn-* or *Safen-*, rather than of *Sabino-*; but it is a pure Latin word as Latin is the only dialect which rejects medial *f*.'—R. S. Conway.

B.C. 341) *alteri consuli Aemilio ingresso Sabellum agrum non castra Samnitium, non legiones usquam oppositae:* x. 19, 20 (B.C. 296) *cohortium Sabellarum.* So too in Horace *Sat.* ii. 1, 36 (relating to the foundation of Venusia in B.C. 291 after the close of the third Samnite War); I quote from line 34: *sequor hunc Lucanus an Apulus anceps: | nam Venusinus arat finem sub utrumque colonus | missus ad hoc pulsis, vetus est ut fama, Sabellis, | quo ne per vacuum Romano incurreret hostis, sive quod Apula gens seu quod Lucania bellum | incuteret violenta.* Here *Sabellus* clearly means 'Samnite,' and we may also note the use of the plural as a noun, 'the Samnites,' a use found also in Pliny iii. 12, 107, (quoted below). What tribes precisely Horace would have included under the term is of course uncertain; but it is clear that the Sabines of Sabina were not prominently before his mind when he wrote this line.[1] *Lucanus* and *Apulus* are geographical expressions, which have no direct relation to the ethnic term *Sabellus;* but, to say the least, there is nothing here to prevent our regarding the inhabitants of these districts from being included among the *Sabelli.* In the light of this passage is it possible to doubt that when Horace calls himself *Sabellus* in *Epist.* i. 16, 49 (*renuit negitatque Sabellus*) he is referring to his Apulian origin, and not to the fact that he possessed an estate in the Sabine country[2] (as all commentators that I have seen incline to think)? To my mind *Sabellus* here means 'Samnite'; and Horace is tracing his gift of shrewd common sense to his Samnite ancestors, just as in the passage above cited (*Sat.* ii. 1, 34 foll.) he traces his Lucilian pugnacity to his connexion with the same gallant race. Again the Sabellian crone of *Sat.* i. 9, 29 who prophesied as to his future when he was a child should surely be located in Apulia, not in Sabina. In *Epod.* xvii. 28 (*Sabella pectus increpare carmina, caputque Marsa dissilire nenia*) the juxtaposition of the words *Sabellus* and *Marsus* points in the same direction.[3] *Od.* iii. 6, 38 (*Sabellis docta ligonibus versare glebas*) would be inconclusive either way, were we not reminded by the whole passage (33–40) of the *Marsus et Apulus* of the preceding ode (l. 9).

When Horace means 'Sabine,' he says *Sabinus: Od.* i. 9, 7 (*Sabina diota*), i. 20, 1 (*vile Sabinum*), i. 22, 9 (*silva in Sabina*, a wood on his Sabine estate, as Dr. Gow says in his excellent edition), ii. 18, 14 (*unicis Sabinis*), iii. 1, 47 (*valle Sabina*), iii. 4, 22 (*in arduos Sabinos,*) *Epod.* ii. 41 (*Sabina qualis aut perusta solibus pernicis uxor Apuli:* in fact *qualis Sabina aut Sabella*), *Epist.* i. 7, 77 (*arvum coelumque Sabinum*), ii. 1, 25 (*vel cum rigidis aequala Sabinis*), *Sat.* ii. 7, 118 (*opera agro nona Sabino*).

The same tale is told by the Virgilian use of the two words *Sabellus* and *Sabinus* (metrical equivalents). Conington on *Georg.* ii. 167 and *Aen.* vii. 665 interprets *Sabellus* as 'Samnite'; and this is I think supported by the proximity of *Marsi* in the former passage. *Aen.* viii. 510 (*mixtus matre Sabella*) is inconclusive; so is *Georg.* iii. 255 (*Sabellicus sus*). But could Virgil have written *raptas sine more Sabellas* in *Aen.* viii. 635, instead of *r. s. m. Sabinas?* For his use of *Sabinus* see also *Georg.* ii. 532 (*veteres Sabini*), *Aen.* vii. 709 (*postquam in partem data Roma Sabinis,*) *ibid.* 706 (*Sabinorum prisco de sangine*); *ibid.* 178 (*Sabinus* as a proper name).

Turning to Juvenal we find that he too uses two distinct words, *Sabellus* and *Sabinus,* presumably in distinct senses: iii. 169 *ad Marsos mensamque Sabellam* (in the same connexion as in Hor. *Epod.* xvii. 28), *ibid.* 85 *baca Sabina*, x. 229 *veteres imitata Sabinos.*

To these passages I have to add two distinct *statements* by classical writers of widely different ages to the same effect. Varro, *Sat. Menipp.* 17 (ed. Bücheler) says *Terra culturae causa attributa olim particulatim hominibus, ut Etruria Tuscis, Samnium Sabellis:* this passage is quoted by Junius Philargyrius on Virg. *Georg.* ii. 167, and seems tolerably conclusive. Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* iii. 12, 107 *Samnitium, quos Sabellos et Graeci Saunitas dixere, colonia Bovianum,* etc.

The above does not claim to be an exhaustive list of instances. But I should be surprised if the evidence which it affords is overthrown by any passages which can be cited. What is the evidence for *Sabellus* = 'Sabine'?

E. A. SONNENSCHEIN.

[1] If Horace included the Sabines, we have an instance of the word in a classical author in the Niebuhrian sense.

[2] A man who owns a Scottish moor does not for that reason call himself a Scot!

[3] So at least thought Niebuhr, *Hist. of Rome*, p. 91 'The Marsians, Pelignians, Samnites and Lucanians called themselves *Savini* [Safinim?]; this is certain at least about the Samnites, from the denary coined during the Social War.' How far more modern research confirms the connexion between the Marsi and the Samnites I do not undertake to say.

ON A POINT OF METRE IN GREEK TRAGEDY.

Pupils learning to scan and write Greek Iambics, anapaestic dimeters, or trochaic tetrameters catalectic, are told that before a mute followed by a liquid or nasal it is permissible to lengthen the syllable, or rather that they are at full liberty to treat such a syllable as either long or short according to the requirements of the metre. The usual qualification is, of course, made that, before the 'soft' mutes β. γ. δ. followed by λ. μ. ν., the syllable is always long. In composing Attic senarii the average pupil (and, may we not say, teacher?) would not, therefore, see anything to which to object, on metrical grounds, in such a line as that of Archilochus

κύψαντες ὕβριν ἀθρόην ἀπέφλυσαν,

and probably both teacher and pupil would be surprised to learn that this single verse contains as many 'lengthenings' as occur on the average in 240 lines of Aeschylus, 120 lines of Sophocles, and, say, 150 lines of Euripides.

In the *Arundines Cami* (6th edit. p. 307) the reader will find an eminent scholar writing in anapaestic dimeters

ῥείθροις πρηνέστιν Ἄτλαντείοις
δίφρος ὁ Φοίβου χρυσεόκυκλος,

and no suspicion will cross his mind that there could be anything unusual in the sound of these lines to the ears of an Athenian audience.

Again, he may be reading the *Electra* of Euripides and find verse 629 printed thus :—

οὐδεὶς παρῆν Ἀργεῖος, ὀθνεία δὲ χείρ,

and on glancing at the footnote he may observe the brief remark "οἰκεία L. ὀθνεία Camper." He may (and should) consider the emendation no emendation, but it would almost certainly surprise him to learn that there is no instance in all tragedy of a lengthening before θν in senarii, anapaestic dimeters, or trochaic tetrameters. Despite the temptations of τεθνάναι, ἔθνος, etc., the lengthening nowhere occurs.

In the lacuna of Aesch. *Agam.* 1664

σώφρονος γνώμης δ' ἁμαρτεῖν τὸν κρατοῦντα —υ—

the student will usually find supplied 'θ' ὑβρίσαι Blomfield,' and, familiar as he is with ὕβρις in Aeschylus, he will have no doubt on the score of quantity. Nevertheless, in the kinds of verse above enumerated, Aeschylus never has ὕβρις or ὑβρίζειν either in the plays or the fragments. He *may*, of course, have lengthened the syllable in this instance, but, as the conjecture is probably wholly wrong for other reasons, he almost certainly did not. Sophocles, indeed, has the word (or its cognates) with lengthening seven times; but in an emendation of Aeschylus it is the probabilities for Aeschylus alone which must be considered.

It therefore appears that the importance of this question extends far beyond the elegant exercises of schoolboys and undergraduates, though even these deserve to be carried out with absolute accuracy if they are to be carried out at all. And in the latter connexion it may be remarked, for instance, that a teacher of Greek verses of the kinds specified should decline to admit any lengthening of an initial augment in these so-called optional positions, on the ground that, in all the many thousands of such verses in Attic tragedy, no instances are discoverable but ἐκλήθης and ἐπλήσθη (each once in Euripides). ἔθρισε (once in Aeschylus) is evidently not to be brought into the question, being a syncopated form.

The common words ἀγρός, ἐρυθρός, πικρός, ἀκμή, ἱκνεῖσθαι, δίφρος, τέχνη, etc. do much duty in Greek composition, and probably have their lengthenings almost as often as not. And yet it remains a fact that, in the three metres above-named, ἀγρός occurs with lengthening but twice (ἀγρόθεν once), ἐρυθρός not at all (except in the proper noun Ἐρυθραί), πικρός only twice (πικρότης once), ἀκμή once (ἀκμαῖος once), ἱκνεῖσθαι once (ἀφικνεῖσθαι once), δίφρος once, τέχνη once (τεχνᾶσθαι once).

I have examined with some care the senarii, anapaestic dimeters and trochaic tetrameters of the plays and fragments of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, and though I am not prepared to make an affidavit that I have overlooked no single instance of lengthening (*ars longa vita brevis*), I think it highly improbable that any considerable error will be found in the data afforded by the following tables. It will be seen at once that the lengthenings are mainly confined to certain groups of words. Other deductions will be given at the end of the lists.

Total Number of Lengthenings in the Plays and Fragments of the Tragic Dramatists (omitting for the present the *Rhesus*, *Cyclops*, *Iphigenia in Aulis* and satyric fragments) in iambic senarii, anapaestic dimeters and trochaic tetrameters.

	Aesch.	Soph.	Eur.	Total.
βρ				
ἄβρός	—	—	3	3
ἁβρότης	—	—	1	1
ἁβροδίαιτος	1	—	—	1
ἁβροχίτων	1	—	—	1
νεβρίς	—	—	1	1
ὕβρις	—	2	1	3
ὑβρίζειν	—	1	3	4
ἐφ—	—	1	2	3
καθ—	—	2	6	8
ἐγκαθ—	—	—	1	1
ὑβριστής	—	1	—	1
γρ				
ἄγριος	3	11	14	28
ἀγριωπός	—	—	1	1
ἀγρός	—	1	1	2
ἀγρόθεν	—	—	1	1
ἄγραυλος	—	—	1	1
ἄγρα	—	—	1	1
ἀγρεύω	—	1	2	3
ἄγρυπνος	1	—	—	1
σύαγρος	—	1	—	1
Φλεγραῖος	1	—	—	1
ὑγρός	—	—	3	3
ὑγρότης	—	—	1	1
ὑγραίνειν	—	—	1	1
ὑγρόβολος	—	—	1	1
δρ				
ἕδρα	—	2	1	3
σύνεδρος	—	1	—	1
ἐφ—	—	—	1	1
προσ—	—	1	—	1
παρ—	—	—	2	2
συνεδρία	1	—	—	1
προσ—	—	—	2	2
ἐφεδρεύω	—	—	2	2
προσ—	—	—	1	1
ἄϊδρις	1	1	—	2
ἱδρύω	—	—	2	2
καθ—	—	—	2	2
ἐγκαθ—	—	—	1	1
ἀνίδρυτος	—	—	1	1
κέδρος	—	—	1	1
κέδρινος	—	—	1	1
Ἄδραστος	—	—	1	1
ἐπιδρομή	—	—	1	1
θρ				
μέλαθρον	4	1	27	32
ὕλεθρος	—	3	2	5
ὀλέθριος	—	1	1	2
λάθρα	—	—	2	2
λαθραίως	—	—	1	1
Ἐρυθραί	—	—	1	1
[ἔθρισα	1	—	—	1
ἀπ— (syncopated)	—	—	2	2]
θλ				
γένεθλον	4	2	1	7
γενέθλιος	1	1	1	3

	Aesch.	Soph.	Eur.	Total.
θμ				
ἀριθμός	2	4	16	22
ἀριθμεῖν	—	1	1	2
ἀναρίθμητος	—	1	—	1
τοσουτάριθμος	1	—	—	1
θν				
(none)				
κρ				
ἄκρος	3	8	12	23
ἀκραῖος	—	—	1	1
ἀκροθίνιον	1	—	3	4
Ἀκροκόρινθος	—	—	1	1
ὑπερακρίζειν	—	—	1	1
νεκρός	2	3	17	22
δάκρυα (not sing.)	—	4	18	22
δακρύειν	—	1	2	3
ἄδακρυς	—	—	1	1
ἀρτίδακρυς	—	—	1	1
πικρός	—	1	1	2
πικρότης	—	—	1	1
μακρός	—	3	1	4
ἀποκρύπτειν	1	—	—	1
ἀποκρίνειν	—	1	—	1
ἐπικραίνω	1	—	—	1
ἐπίκρανον	—	—	1	1
ἐπικρύπτω	—	—	1	1
ὀκρίς	1	—	—	1
ἀκραγής	1	—	—	1
κλ				
κύκλος	1	—	2	3
Κύκλωπες	—	—	1	1
κέκλημαι	—	2	1	3
ἐκλήθης	—	—	1	1
κικλήσκειν	—	—	1	1
ὁμοκλή	1	—	—	1
ὁμοκλεῖν	—	1	—	1
Ἡρακλέης	—	—	14	14
Πάτροκλος	—	1	—	1
Ἄμυκλαι	—	—	1	1
ἀκλεής	—	—	1	1
ἐπέκλωσεν	—	—	1	1
κατακλύσειν	—	—	1	1
κμ				
ἀκμή	—	—	1	1
ἀκμαῖος	1	—	—	1
κν				
τέκνον	—	31	77	108
ἄτεκνος	—	—	10	10
ὄκνος	—	1	—	1
ἄοκνος	—	1	—	1
ὀκνῶ	—	4	1	5
κατ—	1	1	—	2
πρόκνη	—	1	—	1
Κύκνος	—	—	1	1
κυκνόμορφος	1	—	—	1
ἱκνεῖσθαι	—	1	—	1
ἀφ—	—	1	—	1
πρ				
Κύπρις	—	2	14	16
Κύπρος	—	—	1	1
θεόπροπος	1	—	—	1

	Aesch.	Soph.	Eur.	Total.
πλ				
πέπλος	1	2	11	14
ὅπλα	—	4	18	22
ὁπλίτης	—	—	4	4
ὁπλίζειν	—	—	1	1
ἔνοπλος	—	—	1	1
ἐπλήσθη	—	—	1	1
διπλόος	1	—	—	1
πν				
ὕπνος	—	6	3	9
ἄυπνος	1	—	2	3
ἐνύπνιον	2	—	—	2
ἐριπναί	—	—	1	1
Θέραπναι	—	—	1	1
πρ				
πατρός(-ί)	3	49	78	130
πατρίς	—	1	11	12
πάτριος	—	1	—	1
πατρικός	—	—	1	1
πατρῷος	1	2	6	9
πατρόθεν	—	1	—	1
πατροφόντης	—	2	—	2
Ἀτρεύς	1	3	5	9
Ἀτρεῖδαι	—	9	—	9
θυγατρός(-ί)	—	2	11	13
πέτρα	—	1	5	6
πέτρος	—	1	5	6
πετρήρης	—	1	—	1
μέτρον	—	1	1	2
μέτριος	—	—	1	1
μετρεῖν	—	—	1	1
ἀμέτρητος	—	—	1	1
γηροτρόφος	—	—	1	1
μηλο—	1	—	—	1
παντο—	1	—	—	1
ὀτρύνω	—	1	—	1
ἐπ—	—	1	—	1
ἀποτρέπουσι	1	—	—	1
ἀπότροπος	—	—	1	1
ἀποτροπή	1	—	—	1
λατρεύω	1	1	—	2
ἄροτρον	1	—	—	1
ἄτρυτος	1	—	—	1
ἀλίτριος	—	1	—	1
ἴτρια	—	1	—	1
φάρετρα	—	—	1	1
ἱστοτριβής	1	—	—	1
προτρέπω	—	1	—	1
Ἀμφιτρυών	—	—	2	2
ἐπιτρέπω (?)	—	—	1	1
τλ				
σχέτλιος	1	3	5	9
ἀνατλάς	—	—	1	1
τμ				
πότμος	1	2	2	5
ἀτμός	1	—	1	2
ἀτμίζω	—	1	—	1
ἐρετμά	—	—	2	2
ἐρετμόω	—	—	1	1
ἐφετμή	4	—	—	4
τν				
πότνια	—	2	8	10
πίτνω	—	—	1	1
προ—	—	1	—	1
προσ—	—	—	1	1

	Aesch.	Soph.	Eur.	Total.
φρ				
ἐλαφρός	1	—	1	2
ἐλαφρίζω	—	—	1	1
ἄφρων	—	—	2	2
κακόφρων	—	1	1	2
φιλοφρόνως	—	1	—	1
ἀφρός	—	—	3	3
Ἀφροδίτη	—	—	5	5
ὀφρύς	—	—	1	1
ὀφρύη	—	—	1	1
δίφρος	—	—	1	1
Ἀρταφρένης	1	—	—	1
φλ				
τυφλός	—	—	5	5
ἐπέφλεγε	1	—	—	1
φν				
ἀφνεός	—	1	—	1
ἔπεφνε	—	1	1	2
χρ				
πολύχρυσος	—	1	5	6
λέχριος	—	—	1	1
χλ				
ὄχλος	—	—	9	9
ἀναμοχλεύω	—	—	1	1
χμ				
λιχμᾶν	—	—	1	1
ὀχμάζειν	1	—	—	1
χν				
ἴχνος	—	1	6	7
ἰχνεύω	—	1	—	1
τέχνη	—	—	1	1
τεχνᾶσθαι	—	1	—	1
λίχνος	—	—	1	1

The *Rhesus* and the *Iphigenia in Aulis*, by reason of their dubious authenticity, and the *Cyclops*, in view of its peculiar metrical character as a satyric play, seem to require separate examination. The result is striking. No new groups or elements whatever are added to the lists given above, except τέτρᾰπους (*Rhes.* 211) and ἄκρᾰτος (*Cycl.* 149). Thus the additions fall under heads previously found, as follows: ἁβρότης (1), καθυβρίζειν (1); ὑγρός (1); ἑδραῖος (1), ἔφεδρος (2); γένεθλον (3); μέλαθρον (5); Κύκλωψ (4); τέκνον (7); ἄκρος (1), ἀκροθίνιον (1), δάκρυα (7); ὅπλα (1), ὁπλίζειν (2); ὕπνος (2), ἄυπνος (2); ἐφετμή (1), ἐρετμά (1), πότμος (1); πότνια (1); πατρός (2), πατρίς (2), πατρῷος (1), πάτριος (1), πέτρα (1), πετραῖος (1), θυγατρός (5), Ἀτρεύς (4), φάρετρα (1); τυφλοῦν (1); Ἀφροδίτη (1), ὀφρύς (1), κακόφρονες (1); ὄχλος (3); ἴχνος (1), ἰχνεύω (1).

The conclusions which I draw from the data are briefly these:—

(*a*) That the lengthening was habitual only to certain words e.g. τέκνον and πατρός

(which two, with their cognates amount to about one-third of the whole number).

(*b*) That words which were lengthened with anything like frequency were archaic words, proper names, and words necessarily very familiar in a lengthened quantity in epic and gnomic poetry, from which they brought literary associations, e.g. *μέλαθρον, γένεθλον, πότνια*; Ἡρακλέης, Κύπρις, Ἀτρεύς; *δάκρυα, ὕβρις, ὅπλα, νεκρός*, etc.

(*c*) That in other cases the lengthening was abnormal, and as conscious and cautious as in *μοῦνος, ξεῖνος*, etc., or as in *φαιδχίτωνες, ὄφις*, or even as in the use of the forms *μέσσος, χείρεσσι, ὔμμε*, etc. which occur once or twice in senarii. There seems to be no other way of accounting for the fact that many words common in tragedy should receive lengthening only once in many thousands of lines, while others, which would seem to offer occasion enough, are not lengthened at all.

These conclusions are borne out by two considerations: (i) the paratragoedia of comedy, which at once shows itself by these occasional lengthenings, implies that Athenian ears were quick at detecting them, that, therefore, they were distinctly artificial, and that an excess of them in dialogue would have bordered on the absurd: (ii) the tragic senarius is, according to Aristotle, *λεκτικόν*, and as, therefore, it avoids *γλῶσσαι* and other rarities, so it avoids that which in any other way departs too far from the ordinary *λέξις*.

For fear any stubborn reader of these remarks should suspect that the lengthenings may, after all, have been largely a matter of accident, and that the tragedians lengthened at any time and with any frequency to suit their metre, the conclusive answer had better be stated at once. Archilochus has on the average one lengthening in 5 lines, Simonides two in 9 lines, Solon two in 13 lines, Hipponax two in 13. (Aeschylus has one in 80.) If with all the resources of their tongue at their disposal these writers found frequent lengthening convenient, why should not the tragedians find it equally so for the same metres? And if it is replied that Archilochus or Simonides or Solon deliberately sought such lengthenings for 'poetical' purposes, and went beyond mere convenience for the sake of effect, is it not thereby conceded that the tragedians did *not* seek them for such poetical purposes, had no desire to create the same effect, and were more cautious of departing from the current pronunciation? Moreover, if convenience had determined the matter, it must have been a remarkable series of accidents which left tens of thousands of lines with only two initial augments lengthened, and with only isolated instances in such convenient words as *ἐπικραίνειν, λάθρα, ἀπότροπος*, etc.

T. G. Tucker.

University of Melbourne.

PARTIAL OBLIQUITY IN QUESTIONS OF RETORT.

The origin of the well-known use of *ut* in the exclamatory question seems to me not yet adequately explained. Of the advanced school-grammars used in America Allen and Greenough's classes this locution as a result-clause of elliptical nature: elliptical certainly in the examples they have chosen: (1) Cic. Cat. 1. 9.—quamquam quid loquor? te ut ulla res frangat? Here, however, *ut* is a purpose-particle after *loquor*, or rather the repetend '*loquar*' which must be supplied: (2) Cic. Tusc. ii. 42—Age, sis, nunc de ratione videamus, nisi quid vis ad haec. ‡ Egone (sc. '*velim*') ut te interpellem? ne hoc quidem vellem. (3) Cic. ad Quint. Frat. i. 3—mi frater...tune id veritus es, ne ego iracundia aliqua adductus pueros ad te sine litteris miserim? aut etiam ne te videre noluerim? Ego tibi irascerer, tibi ego irasci possem?.....*Ego te videre noluerim?* Obviously the last question is a mere repetend, and the omission of the *ut* should have warned against the explanation of the locution as a result-clause.

Gildersleeve denies a conscious ellipsis, but seems to lean to the result-clause, saying in a note: The expression is closely parallel with the Acc. and Infin. The one objects to the idea; the other to any state of things that could produce the result.

The nearest approach I have seen to the explanation I am about to suggest is to be found in Riemann's Syntaxe Latine[2] § 168: Le latin emploie le subjonctif (présent ou parfait) dans une proposition interrogatif pour marquer qu'on *proteste énergiquement* contre telle ou telle *affirmation*...(ego, tibi irascar? 'moi, me fâcher contre toi').

Further on, in a footnote: s'il est question du passé, on emploie, dans le même sens, *l'imparfait* du subjonctif (ici l'affirmation contre laquelle on proteste serait à *l'aoriste* de l'indicatif); ego tibi irascerer? 'moi, me fâcher contre toi (*à tel moment du passé*)?' A subsequent footnote suggests that this use of the subjunctive is akin to the deliberative.

I would myself refer the locution just described to partial obliquity, and cite the following example,

Plaut. Most. 556:

quid nunc faciundum censes? ‡ Egon quid censeam?

Here *quid censeam* is a repetend, echoing *quid censes*, and its mood is due to virtual oratio obliqua. The phrase is shorthand for Rogasne quid censeam? just as in the stock example, Socrates accusatus est quod iuventutem corrumperet, '*quod corrumperet*' is shorthand for *quod—corrumpere dicebant*.

The echoing subjunctive is a common feature of Plautus's style. Thus at Capt. 208 *fugam fingitis* is echoed in retort by the query *fugiamus nos?* and at 139 *egone illum non fleam?* is the retort to *ne fle*. At Most. 182–3 the echo is affected by change of tense:

ita Philolaches tuos te *amet*.
‡ . . . quo modo adiurasti? ita ego istam *amarem*?

Just so, in Cicero's letter to Quintus cited above, *ego tibi irascerer* is an echo of the words *tu mihi irasceris* or *vereor ne tu mihi irascaris*, say, which must have stood in Quintus's letter.

It is along this line that I would explain the construction of *ut* in the exclamatory question. Riemann has already seen the analogy between these *ut*-sentences and the echoing subjunctive, but declares for an ellipsis, thus saying that *ut* governs the subjunctive in this locution.

I cite the following instances from Plautus.

(1) Men. 681–3:

tibi *dedi* equidem illam (*sc.* pallam)...
et illud spinter...
‡ mihi tu *ut dederis* pallam et spinter?

Here it is perfectly clear (cf. Capt. 208 cited above) that sense and grammar admit of the excision of *ut* altogether. We might render the retort colloquially thus: *How!* You gave me a cloak and brooch?

(2) Most. 1017:

Quod me absente hic tecum filius
negoti *gessit!* ‡ mecum *ut* ille hic *gesserit* dum tu hinc abes, negoti?

Here the retort echoes the question so exactly word for word, that one is almost tempted to believe that *ut* repeats *quod*.

(3) Pers. 131:

hic leno neque te *novit* neque gnatam tuam,
‡ Me *ut* quisquam *norit*, nisi ille qui praebet cibum?

The *ut* could be dispensed with equally well in all three examples, and I do not think it at all necessary to render *ut?* by *how?* in every case. In Plautus the question 'are you well'? may be asked in three ways: (1) *vales?* (2) *valen* (=*valesne*)? (3) *ut vales?* and I take it that *ut* means no more than *-ne*. Analogous uses of *ut*, not to go here into etymological considerations, are found in the optative phrases *valeat, ut valeat*, where *ut* adds no appreciable force; and in the jussive-phrases *ea mihi reddas, ea ut mihi reddas* (cf. Rud. 1127), where also the *ut* is of a vanishing nature. I do not supply myself any *vide* in such sentences, but believe that *vide* arose later to reinforce, or motivate an *ut* no longer understood. The use of *ne* and *ut* in indirect commands can only have been based, in my opinion, on *ne* and *ut* used for direct commands.

In a like fashion the interrogative force of *ut* was dying out, and so *-ne* came in to reinforce it. The chain of development was after this fashion:

(1) indotatam te uxorem patiar? without interrogative sign. (Capt. 208).

(2) ut indotatam te uxorem patiar? with interrogative sign. (Cf. Most. 1017).

(3) egone indotatam te uxorem patiar? = (1) reinforced by interrogative -ne. (Cf. Capt. 139).

(4) egone indotatam te uxorem ut patiar (Trin. 378)? = (2) reinforced by an interrogative sign after *ut* began to wane as a pale interrogative.

This explanation of the 'exclamatory-question *ut*' seems to me to be confirmed by the use of the accusative and infinitive in the same way, but in the latter case the obliquity is complete. A good example is Aeneid 1. 37, mene incepto desistere? which echoes an implied incepto tuo desiste. In Terence (Hec. 612) the same usage appears without interrogative signs: hinc abire matrem?

Edwin W. Fay.

Lexington, Va.

A STYLISTIC VALUE OF THE PARENTHETIC PURPOSE-CLAUSE.

Liv. vii. 1. 7. ne quando a metu ac periculis vacarent pestilentia ingens orta, etc.

Ib. 27. 1. ne nimis laetae res essent pestilentia civitatem adorta coegit etc.

Ib. x. 1. 4. tamen, ne prorsus inbellem agerent annum, parva expeditio in Umbria facta est, etc.

Ib. 6. 3. tamen, ne undique tranquillae res essent, certamen iniectum inter primores civitatis, etc.

Ib. vi. 34. 5. ne id nimis laetum parti alteri esset parva—causa intervenit, etc.

There is some difficulty about the *ne*-clauses here. Purpose-clauses they are, but they do not stand in a simple relation to the leading verbs. Weissenborn's note on the first passage is: die Absicht statt der Folge. The two first examples might be made ordinary purpose-clauses by personifying *pestilentia.*

The word *nimis* occurs in two of these passages, and *quando, undique, prorsus* strike the same note in the other three. All the sentences alike sound the note of doom. It is fate, it is the Gods to whom '*nimietas*' is distasteful. In every case *ne* may be taken to mean *deis nolentibus ut.* We may compare the parenthetic purpose-clause for an analogous construction, but that is more detached from the sentence-structure in sequence. There was probably never a feeling of ellipsis here. It is perhaps explanation enough of the usage in question to describe it as an ironical use of the parenthetic purpose-clause.

Edwin W. Fay.

THE PARTICLE *SIC* AS A SECONDARY PREDICATE.

There are many passages in Latin authors where commentators have found difficulty in explaining the meaning of the particle *sic.* They have rightly or wrongly assumed 'idiomatic' meanings which are very far removed from, and very hard to connect with, its proper signification of *hoc modo.* (Hand. Tursell. iii. 467). Moreover, if anyone will examine carefully the articles on *sic* in the dictionaries of Forcellini, Georges, Lewis and Short, White and Riddle, and the fragmentary work of Key, he must, I think, be struck by the inconsistent and unsatisfactory manner in which it has been treated.

I propose in this paper to show that in some cases at least these difficulties and inconsistencies are due to the fact that commentators and the compilers of dictionaries have failed to perceive that *sic* is sometimes used, not as a simple adverb or as a predicate with *esse,* but as a secondary predicate 'denoting the circumstances under which, or the character in which a person or thing acts or is acted upon.' (Roby, *Lat. Gram.* § 1017 c). The distinction between this use and its use predicatively with *esse* is well illustrated by Ter. Phorm. 210 seqq. *voltum contemplamini; en,* | *satin' sic est?* Ge. *non.* An. *quid si sic?* Ge. *prope modum.* An. *quid sic?* Ge. *sat est.* In *satin' sic est* the word *sic,* 'being thus, like this,' denotes the circumstances under which his face is *satis,* 'will do,' while in *quid si sic* the word *sic* is directly predicated of *voltus* understood. With the words *quid sic* we must supply *est voltus,* and then it is seen that *sic* is again a secondary predicate 'denoting, etc.' Cf. Cic. Rosc. Am. 84 *sic est vita* with Verr. 1, 70 *sic iste . . . . felicior fuit.* We must also distinguish that predicative use to which Madvig refers in his note on Cic. Fin. iv. 63, where the adverb *non tam modum ipsius actionis significat quam quid de actione iudicetur,* to which belong Propertius' *sic maestae cecinere tubae,* and expressions like *sic volo, sic iubeo, sic postulo.*

I shall now deal with some passages which illustrate the view I am advocating, but which have been differently explained by well known commentators. I shall endeavour to show that the apparent variations in the meaning of *sic* are due, not to any real change of meaning, but to a difference of relation to the other words in the various sentences. In some of these, *sic,* like other colourless terms in Latin, may require a stronger rendering in English, with a complexion derived from the context, but in all it will be seen that it literally means 'thus' or 'such,' preceded by 'being' or 'when,' as is usual with secondary predicates in English.

Plaut. Amph. 117 *huc processi sic cum servili schema.* Here *sic* clearly indicates the character in which he comes forth, and is further explained by *cum s. s.* following; it cannot possibly have any other relation to the rest of the sentence. The use of an explanatory phrase immediately following *sic* I have pointed out in my note on *sic temere*, which appeared in the *Class. Review*, April 1896, pp. 157–158.

Plaut. Cas. 704 seqq. *gladium Casinam intus habere ait qui med atque ted evitet.* OL. *scio. sic sine habere. nugas agunt. novi ego illas malas merces.* It may be noticed that *intus* is a secondary predicate as well as *sic*, the latter being = *talem*. For *talis* as secondary predicate cf. Ter. Eun. 160 *istam nunc times* . . . . . ne illum talem praeripiat tibi. Verg. Georg. 3, 92 *talis et ipse iubam cervice effudit equina | Saturnus.*

I explain *sic* similarly in Plaut. Ps. 389 *nolo bis iterari: sat sic longae fiunt fabulae.* Bacch. 1005 *sat sic suspectus sum, quom careo noxia*, where *quom c. n.* explains *sic*. Mil. 854 *ibi erat bilibris aula, sic propter cados.* Ter. Hec. 283 seqq. *hacine causa ego eram tanto opere cupidus redeundi domum! hui! | quanto fuerat praestibilius ubivis gentium agere aetatem | quam huc redire*, etc. PAR. *at sic citius qui te expedias his aerumnis reperias. | si non rediisses*, etc. Here *sic* = 'being thus,' i.e. 'being back,' i.e. 'having returned.'

Cic. Rosc. Am. 71 *noluerunt feris corpus obicere; ne bestiis quoque quae tantum scelus attigissent immanioribus uteremur; non sic nudos in flumen deicere.* Halm's note is: '*sic nudos, nackt wie sie sind*, in unmittelbarer nacktheit; Liv. ii. 10, 11 *sic armatus desiluit.*' The Clarendon Press editor translates 'naked as they were'; Lewis and Short explain similarly under the heading 'demonstrative temporal force.' I object to these explanations because (1) they make *sic* a mere redundancy with *nudos*; (2) 'naked as they were,' if it has any meaning at all, implies they were naked at the time, which does not appear from the context; (3) I have no doubt that *nudos* merely means 'uncovered' as opposed to *in culleum insutos;* (4) it seems to me that the only way in which a satisfactory meaning can be obtained is by taking *sic* as a secondary predicate pointing to *tantum scelus*, and so = 'being such,' i.e. 'so wicked.' For this use of *sic* equivalent to an adjective suggested by a preceding substantive cf. Mart. 2, 1, 11 seqq. *esse tibi tanta cantus brevitate videris? | hei mihi quam multis sic quoque longus eris!* where *sic* = *tam brevis*. Cf. also the passages from Lucretius and Vergil cited below. The interpretation which I suggest will be found to give additional force to Cicero's words.

Lucretius v. 436 seqq. *sed nova tempestas quaedam molesque coorta | omne genus de principiis discordia quorum | intervalla vias conexus pondera plagas | concursus motus turbabat proelia miscens | propter dissimilis formas variasque figuras | quod non omnia sic poterant coniuncta manere.*

Munro translated the last two lines thus: 'because by reason of their unlike forms and varied shapes they could not all remain thus joined together.' But if this be correct, what manner of joining is meant by 'thus'? Dr. Duff in the Pitt Press edition says: '*sic* 'straight off,' 'at once,' οὕτωσί. Cf. 970.' Can it be shown that *sic* ever has this assumed 'idiomatic' meaning? In line 970 *sic* is a conjectural insertion made by Munro, who explains it as = *sicut erant* or *negligenter*, quoting for that meaning sundry passages, in none of which is either of those meanings certain, or necessary. To examine these passages here would involve a too lengthy digression, but I may point out that Munro's view of Persius *sic poeta prodirem* has been abandoned by Conington and Nettleship, while I have shown in the *Classical Review*, April 1896, that Horace's *sic temere* admits of a better explanation.

Lewis and Short (p. 1691[a]) quote Lucr. v. 441 above for *sic* as 'a local demonstrative accompanied by a corresponding gesture.' If so, what does it mean?

I suggest therefore that *sic* should be taken in its ordinary sense of 'thus' or 'such,' equivalent to *dissimilia formis figurisque* and standing to *omnia* in the relation of a secondary predicate 'denoting the character, etc.' Then the words *propter* . . . . . *figuras* will go with *proelia miscens*, and the last line of the passage will be translated 'because being of this kind, so unlike, they could not all remain joined together.' Thus a satisfactory meaning is obtained.

Verg. Aen. 5, 618 seqq. *fit Beroe* . . . . *ac sic Dardanidum mediam se matribus infert.* Here commentators like Sidgwick pass over the difficulty, or like Conington leave the meaning of *sic* unexplained. I suggest that it is exactly similar to *talis* in Georg. 3, 92 cited above, and is a secondary predicate = *Beroen simulans.*

Similarly Aen. 6, 680 seqq. *atque hic Aeneas; una namque ire videbat | egregium forma iuvenem et fulgentibus armis | sed frons laeta parum et deiecto lumina voltu: quis pater ille virum qui sic comitatur euntem?*

Here *sic* refers to *egregium forma, etc., deiecto lumina voltu*, and denotes the character in which the younger Marcellus accompanies the elder. This was partially perceived by Forbiger, whereas Conington's 'thus as we see' misses or evades the exact meaning of the particle.

Hor. Sat. 1, 4, 135, *hoc faciens vivam melius ; sic dulcis amicis | occurram.* Here *sic* stands in the same relation to *occurram* as *hoc faciens* does to *vivam.*

Ovid Met. 1, 695 seqq. *ritu quo cincta Dianae | falleret, et credi posset Latonia si non | corneus huic arcus si non foret aureus illi. sic quoque fallebat.* Here *sic* = *corneo arcu* and stands in the same relation to *fallebat* as *cincta* does to *falleret.* Cf. 13, 896 *sed sic quoque erat tamen Acis*, where also *sic* = 'being thus,' i.e. 'in this form.'

Sallust, Cat. 7, *sed gloriae maximum certamen inter ipsos erat ; sic quisque hostem ferire properabet.* Here *sic* = *maxime certans.* The failure to perceive its true meaning accounts for the variant *se* and Gründel's suggested *ac si.*

Propertius 2, 8, 15 seqq. *ecquandone tibi liber sum visus ? an usque | in nostram iacies verba superba caput ? | sic igitur prima moriere aetate, Properti ?—sed morere ; interitu gaudeat illa tuo.* Here *sic* = 'thus flouted,' *verbis superbis caput impulsus*, and thus fittingly connects vv. 17 seqq. with what has preceded (cf. Nägelsbach, *Lat. Styl.* p. 608), refuting the contention of Lachmann and Müller that a new elegy begins at v. 17.

Tacitus, Ann. 1, 34, *adsistentem contionem in manipulos discedere iubet : sic melius audituros responsum.* Furneaux tr. *sic* 'as they were,' comparing Ann. 4, 40, 4 and 15, 17, 3 for this so-called idiomatic meaning. I suggest that *sic* 'like this' is merely a secondary predicate, and = *adsistentes.* In Ann. 4, 40, 4, (*simplicius acturum de inimicitiis primum Agrippinae, quas longe acrius arsuras, si matrimonium Liviae velut in partes domum Caesaris distraxisset. Sic quoque erumpere aemulationem feminarum.*) *sic* seems to mean simply 'in this manner,' viz. *distrahendo in partes domum Caesaris.* The other passage which Furneaux cites is Ann. 15, 17, 3, *quando in incerto habeantur Parthorum conatus, Suriam repetiturum; sic quoque optimam Fortunam orandam, ut pedes confectus itinerum spatiis . . . . . equitem adsequeretur.* Here *sic* either suggests *repetenti* and is a secondary predicate denoting the circumstance under which Fortune is to be addressed by Corbulo, or it may be taken as pointing to the following *ut* clause, which will then be explanatory. Cf. Cic. Or. iii. 46, *sic agam vobiscum . . . . . ut aliquid de vestris vitiis audiatis.*

Before concluding, I must mention one more passage, Livy, 2, 10, 12, which is usually cited in support of the current explanation of Cic. Rosc. Am. 71. Livy's words are : *clamore sublato undique in unum hostem tela coniciunt, ... iam impetu conabantur detrudere virum cum simul fragor rupti pontis simul clamor impetum sustinuit. tum Coeles 'Tiberine pater,' inquit, '. . . . . hunc militem accipias.' Ita sic armatus in Tiberim desiluit.* Here I see no reason to doubt that *sic* points to what has gone before and = 'being thus circumstanced.' *Ita* of course means 'accordingly.' Hand. Tursell. iii. 485. Different is Quintilian 2, 21, 20 *ita sic quoque recte diximus*, where *sic* points to what follows, 'accordingly the following is also a correct statement.'

J. Stanley.

'NUMNE.'

This form has had an interesting history. Its very existence has been both affirmed and denied. Ritschl, *Opusc.* ii. p. 248 and Hand Tursellinus iv. 79 have denied its Latinity. Neither Georges, *Lex. d. lat. Wort.-form* nor Lindsay, *Latin Lang.*, even mentions it, though the former in his *Lat. Deutsch Wörterb.* cites it for Cic. 'numne vis audire?' But where does this occur? Elmer, *Proc. Am. Phil. Assn.* 1892, p. xx. in a footnote says : 'Hand Tursellinus iv. 79 and Ritschl, *Opusc.* ii. p. 248 are probably right in denying the Latinity of this form.' Stolz in *Handb. d. Klass. Alt. Wissenschaft* ii.[2] does not mention the form at all, but in the *Hist. Gram. d. lat. Spr.* p. 439, § 83 simply records it. Ribbeck, however, *Lat. Part.* p. 13 maintains that the form does occur.

The passages that have been cited for its use are three :

(1) Plautus, *Truc.* ii. 6, 65. Goetz and Schoell however have a different reading here (line 546) : tu num nevis, etc.

(2) Cic. *N.D.* i. 31, 88.

(3) Cic. *Lael.* 11, 36.

Krebs-Schmalz, *Antib.*[6] ii. p. 159 say: 'ist aber noch für Cicero zu halten;' cf. also Schmalz, *Lat. Synt.*[2] § 158. Merguet, *Lex. Phil. Schr.* and Menge, *Repet. d. lat. Spr.*[6] § 409 under '*numne*' cite these passages for Cic. It is the reading of B. and K., Halm, and Mueller.

The following occurrences of this form I have not seen noted:

(1) *Afranius*, 29 (Ribbeck, *Scaen. Rom. Poes. Frag.*):

Terenti numne similem dicent quempiam?

(2) *Dec. Laberius*, 22:

Numne aliter hunce pedicabis?

(3) *Prudentius*, Contra Sym. i. 322:

Numne etiam caeli minor et etc.

(4) *Idem.* ii. 940:

Numne Leontini sulcator solvere etc.

(5) *Idem.* Ham. 871:

Numne animarum oculis denso etc.

The above five well-established occurrences of this form added to the two probable occurrences in Cicero would lead to the conclusion that a denial of its existence is no longer possible.

Emory B. Lease

University of Michigan.

CYPRIAN ἰ = "OR."

In *Ind. Forsch.* ii. p. 219 n. Persson suggested that this word, which is only known from the Idalium-inscription Cauer[2] 472, 24 ἰ ἐξ τῷ κάπῳ, may be identical with the first syllable of ἰ-δέ. But Hoffmann, *Gr. Diall.* i. p. 163, noticing that ᾗ only appears in this inscription before consonants, and comparing the change in the dialect of Idalium of ᾰ̔ to ᾰ̔ before α or ο, supposes a similar change of ᾱ̔ to ῑ̔ before a word beginning with an initial vowel. But perhaps as in Cretan, which sometimes shows μέ for μή before vowels only, though μή before both consonants and vowels (*vide* Schulze, *K.Z.* xxiii p. 133 *seq.*), so in this dialect ᾗ was shortened before initial vowels, and then passed into ῐ̔.

Could the reading ὥς ἰ ἅπασα X 410 be referred in its origin to a similar shortening of εἰ before vowels, ἰ being first graphic representation of εῐ̔, and then changed by grammarians to ἰ?

C. M. Mulvany.

EMENDATIONS OF PLATO, *REPUBLIC* IX. 580 D AND III. 390 A.

The usually accepted reading in Plato, *Rep.* ix. 580 D is εἶεν δή, εἶπον· αὕτη μὲν ἡμῖν ἡ ἀπόδειξις μία ἂν εἴη· δευτέραν δὲ δεῖ τήνδε, ἐάν τι δόξῃ, εἶναι. Τίς αὕτη;

The words δὲ δεῖ are admitted on the authority of Ξ, *q*, and other late MSS.: δεῖ δὲ is the reading of the two best authorities, A and Π. It has not, so far as I can discover, been hitherto pointed out that δεῖ δὲ is a mere orthographical slip for δὲ ἰδὲ. We should read δευτέραν δὲ ἰδὲ τήνδε, ἐάν τι δόξῃ εἶναι. As soon as δὲ ἰδὲ was written δεῖ δέ, the transposition δὲ δεῖ was an obvious, though unsatisfactory, remedy.

Another curious slip has crept into the text of all the MSS. in iii. 390 A τί δέ; ποιεῖν ἄνδρα τὸν σοφώτατον λέγοντα, ὡς δοκεῖ αὐτῷ κάλλιστον εἶναι πάντων, ὅταν παραπλεῖαι ὦσι τράπεζαι

> σίτου καὶ κρειῶν, μέθυ δ' ἐκ κρητῆρος ἀφύσσων
> οἰνοχόος φορέῃσι καὶ ἐγχείῃ δεπάεσσι.

All the MSS. (with one exception) read παραπλεῖαι or παράπλειαι. The word is explained by L. and S. to mean 'almost full.' But surely—not to mention the strange use of παρά—this involves a ridiculous bathos. Why should Odysseus have said it was the *most* beautiful thing in the world (κάλλιστον πάντων) when the tables are *nearly* full of bread and meat? Surely it is an even more beautiful spectacle when they are *quite* full! A reference to the original in Homer *Odyssey* ix. 8 παρὰ δὲ πλήθωσι τράπεζαι shews that we should read

> παρὰ πλεῖαι ὦσι τράπεζαι
> σιτου καὶ κρειῶν κ.τ.λ.,

or else, if we cannot allow the ι in πλεῖαι to be treated for purposes of scansion as α *y*, then

> παρὰ πλέαι ὦσι τράπεζαι κ.τ.λ.

Plato's Homer must have read

> παρὰ δὲ πλέαι (πλεῖαι) ὦσι τράπεζαι,

or else the variant is due to Plato himself.

This correction is perhaps to a slight extent confirmed by the accentuation of one MS.—Cesenas M.[1] In this MS. the word is written παράπλεῖαι (*sic*), with ε above α and ι above ά added by a later hand. But it seems to me more probable that the two accents come from two different hands.

J. ADAM.

[1] I owe my knowledge of this MS. to Prof. Campbell, who has kindly lent me Rostagno's collation.

NOTES ON SOME PASSAGES IN CICERO'S LETTERS *AD FAMILIARES*.

III. 4 § 1: illo libro augurali quem ad me amantissime scriptum suauissimum misisti. The epithet *suauissimum* is tacked on in a manner unlike that of Cicero. Some word such as *donum* or *munus* seems to have fallen out after *scriptum*.

I. 7 § 3: cui quidem (Pompeio) litterae tuae quas proxime miseras, quod facile intellexerim, periucundae fuerunt. The subjunctive *intellexerim* has caused trouble and has often been suspected. Draeger § 488 classes it as limitative; it is rather 'potential,' like the ordinary *crediderim*, the sense of the words *quod facile i.* being 'as I would gladly incline to suppose.' Compare *Att.* II. 22 § 6 quod facile sentias; also *Fam.* XIII. 29 § 7 hoc mihi uelim credas: si quid fecerim hoc ipso in bello minus ex Caesaris uoluntate, quod intellexerim scire ipsum Caesarem me inuitissimum fecisse.... In this latter passage Madvig and Boot read *intellexi*, while Prof. Tyrrell thinks that the mood of *intellexerim* is due to that of *fecerim*. But the subjunctive seems on a par with that in I. 7 § 3; and I have often suspected that *facile* has dropped out in front of it.

IV. 15 § 2: tamen etsi antea scripsi, quae existimaui scribi oportere, tamen hoc tempore breuiter commonendum putaui . . . Some editors (including C. F. W. Müller) insert *te* before *tempore*; but this is surely unnecessary. For *commonere aliquid* 'to convey a warning,' is a good enough expression.

VI. 6 § 2: cum me ex re publica expulissent ei qui illam cadere posse stante me non putarunt....It is very difficult to understand why *putarunt* should have been treated (almost universally) as corrupt. There is no reason why *putarunt* should not be referred to the thoughts which the writer's opponents had at the moment of his expulsion. If for any reason this should be deemed unsatisfactory, it is easy to find passages where *non putaui* is the equivalent of *numquam putaui*.

VIII. 3 § 1: maxime uero ut te dies noctesque quaeram, competitor Hirrus curat. quo modo illum putas auguratus tuum competitorem dolere et dissimulare me certiorem quam se candidatum? de quo ut, quem optas, quam primum nuntium accipias, tua me dius fidius magis quam mea causa cupio. nam mea, si fio si forsitan cum locupletiore referam. Very many have been the emendations of the last sentence. I would propose one which seems to me to depart less widely from the MSS. readings, and at the same time to fit in better with the context than any correction I have seen.. It is this: *nam meā, si fio, forsitan cum locupletiore rēferat* (*sc. fieri*). Caelius says that it is for the sake of Cicero and not for his own sake that he desires Hirrus to fail; so far as his own interest is concerned, it would possibly be of advantage to be elected along with a man richer than himself.

VIII. 9 § 1: post repulsam risus facit ciuem bonum ludit et contra Caesarem sententias dicit; exspectationem corripit; Curionem prorsus Curionem non mediocriter obiurgatus ac repulsa se mutauit.

Much has been written also about this passage. The words *exspectationem corripit* are rightly maintained and interpreted by Mendelssohn. Every emendation of the succeeding words which I have seen rejects the second *Curionem*. I would suggest, as the original reading, Curionem prorsus e Curione...obiurgat: 'he reviles Curio quite in Curio's own style.' C. F. W. Müller ends the sentence with *totus hac repulsa se mutauit*, (after Riemann). It seems to me more likely that *ac* is an error for *sic* (Madvig) or perhaps *ita* which might easily pass to *ac* through *et*.

VIII. 15 § 4: sed tamen quod ob scelus iter mihi necessarium retro ad Alpis uersus incidit? Adeo quod Intimelii in armis sunt.

Adeo has been often changed to *ideo*. Mendelssohn keeps the word, relying on a reference to Landgraf's note 298 to Reisig. No real parallel, however, is there produced. If we suppose that *id* has fallen out before *adeo*, as it easily would after the

final letters of *incidit*, the usage becomes normal. After *id* or other pronoun, *adeo* is often little more than an emphasising particle. *Id* would refer back to *quod ob scelus*.

VIII. 17 § 2: uos inuitos uincere coegero. arrant anum me Catonem.

The last words have been variously emended, always (so far as I have seen) in such a way as to depart considerably from the letters in the MSS. I would add one letter and alter another and propose *narrant anus me Catonem* 'the old ladies babble of me as a very Cato.' The flippancy of the remark suits well the character of the writer, and an assertion that he is regarded as a second Cato suits well the context. I was led to this suggestion by a passage in *Att.* XVI. 1 § 6 where the scapegrace young Quintus Cicero announces himself to his uncle as a reformed character and 'pollicetur se Catonem,' 'undertakes to be a very Cato.' In XV. 29 § 2 the uncle appears to compare the youth to Favonius, 'Cato's ape,' but the words are obscure. Cato figures as a standard of uprightness in XVI. 7 § 4: ergo id erat meum factum quod Catoni probare non possem? flagiti scilicet plenum et dedecoris: utinam a primo ita tibi esset uisum! tu mihi, sicut esse soles, fuisses Cato.

XIII. 69 § 1: haec ad te eo pluribus scripsi ut intellegeres me non uulgare nec ambitiose, sed ut pro homine intimo ac mihi pernecessario scribere.

The corrections of this passage aim at getting rid of *uulgare*, by reading *uolgari more* or the like, but leave *ambitiose scribere* untouched. The phrase is really meaningless. How can *ambitiose scribere* apply to a letter of introduction? I would read, by the slightest of changes, *uolgari nec ambitioso*. These words form a contrast with *intimo ac pernecessario*. The idiom *scribere alicui* with the sense 'to write with reference to some one' is pretty common. To the instances I have quoted in a note on Cic. *Academ.* I. § 8 may be added *Ad Qu. Fratrem* III. 1 § 11; *De Orat.* II. § 341; Sen. *Suas.* II. § 19; Plin. *N.H.* XVIII. § 24; *Avian. Fab.* I. 16; Ovid. *Trist.* II. 245 and 303; *Pont.* III. 351; Martial Pref. to I. Similar datives are found with other verbs which might take a dative of a different kind; so Cic. *Sest.* § 32 ceteris supplicare. The dative *bono* is of the same sort in *Sest.* § 110 cui umquam bene dixit bono? [This is the only passage in Cic. where *bene dicere* occurs]. Ovid. *Trist.* V. 7, 27 nil equidem feci—tu scis hoc ipse—theatris, seems correct though the reading has been disputed; see Mr. Owen's note in his Appendix. For *uolgaris* applied to a person cf. *Ad Qu. Fratrem.* II. 11 § 4 Callisthenes uolgare negotium. I do not understand the suggestion of C. F. W. Müller, to read *uolgarie*.

XV. 2 § 6: amicos in patris eius atque aui iudicio probatos. The *in* has been generally struck out; but it may be right if Cicero was thinking of some very formal expression of opinion. For parallels to *probari in* see my note on Cic. *Academ.* II. § 75.

XVI. 23 § 1: Antonius de lege quid egerit—liceat modo rusticari. Lehmann in his work on the letters to Atticus, brilliantly proposes 'quod egerit,' an elliptical proverbial phrase 'anything he pleases' (*i.e.* I will put up with) and establishes the idiom by parallels. Mendelssohn commends the conjecture, though he does not print it in his text; it is printed by C. F. W. Müller and by Messrs. Tyrrell and Purser. But the next words, *liceat modo rusticari*, incline me to think that *quid* is an error for *quidlibet*. The sentence seems to have been of the same type as *Phil.* II. § 84 quidlibet, modo ne nauseet, faciat; *Acad.* II. § 132 quem libet, modo aliquem; *pro Quinct.* § 97; *Tusc.* 4, 45 and 55; *Att.* XVI. 2 § 3; Ovid. *Pont.* I. 1, 44. Cf. also Mart. IX. 46 (of a man with a mania for building): nunc has, nunc illas reficit mutatque fenestras. | Dum tantum aedificet, quidlibet ille facit; oranti nummos ut etc. So I have no doubt the passage should be punctuated; Friedländer puts a comma at *fenestras*, a full stop at *aedificet*, and a comma again at *facit*. So in *Ad Att.* XV. 20 § 1: Dolabellae mandata sint quaelibet, mihi aliquid, the word *mihi* seems to be an error for *modo*, the contractions $\overset{i}{m}$ and $\overset{o}{m}$ having been confused.

J. S. Reid.

ORATOR = PETITIONER, SUPPLIANT.

The lexicographers are probably wrong in limiting this meaning of *orator* to Plautus and ecclesiastical Latin (Lewis and Short give it only as Plautine). In Ter. *Hec.* 9, *Orator ad vos venio ornatu prologi*, modern editors have followed Donatus in taking *orator* = ambassador; but the idea of petition is clearly predominant, as is shown by the

following *Sinite exorator sim.* Cf. *Prol. Amph.* 34, *Nam iusta ab iustis iustus sum orator datus*, and *passim*, where again the *Prologus* (Mercury) has a *request* to make of the audience. In the only other instance of the use of the word by Terence, *Heaut.* 11, *Oratorem esse voluit me, non prologum*, the same signification is probable; cf. 26 *infra, qua re omnis vos oratos volo.* The close connection in this passage with *actorem* (12) and *orationem* (15) makes it possible to understand *orator* here in a slightly different sense—not 'ambassador,' however, but 'advocate.'

Festus thus understood *Hec.* 9 and Afranius 92, and explained the use as *pro deprecatoribus*; cf. with this explanation Cic. *Imp. Pomp.* 12, 35, *legatos deprecatoresque misissent.* Even in the use of the word of an embassy, it is to be noted that it is used not so much with reference to the spokesman or the fact that the message is oral, as because the ambassador is a petitioner. This is no less true that his petition is in behalf of another. Accordingly, we find regularly mention of the thing for which he is to treat. Cf. Enn. *Ann.* 211, *orator sine pace redit*; Liv. 1, 15, 5, *Veientes pacem petitum oratores Romam mittunt*; Verg. *Aen.* 11, 100, *Iamque oratores aderant...veniamque rogantes*; Plaut. *Poen.* 357, the command *exora* and the retort *sed vide sis, ne tu oratorem hunc pugnis pectas postea*; *Stich.* 494-5, *Haut aequomst te inter oratores accipi*, of the ambassadors, and the retort *Equidem hercle orator sum, sed procedit parum*, of the parasite begging for a dinner.

An overwhelming number of like passages might be cited to prove that *orator* was commonly used of the ambassador as petitioner or intercessor, even in the face of the testimony of Servius (Verg. *Aen.* 11, 100), of Festus (p. 198 Müll., *Orare antiquos dixisse pro agere testimonio est, quod oratores dicti et causarum actores et qui reipublicae mandatas causas agebant*), and even of Varro (*L.L.* 6, 13, *quia verba facit apud eum ad quem legatur*).

J. C. Kirtland, Junr.
Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y.

NOTE ON TER. *AD.* 223–4.

The MS. reading *quasi iam usquam tibi sint viginti minae, Dum huic obsequare* has been generally suspected and variously amended. The majority of editors, accepting the explanation of Donatus (*Quasi numero in aliquo ducas et in aliqua aestimatione constituas: et non, si velis, penitus contemnas viginti minas, dum modo huic obsequaris*), have seen in the supposed abnormal use of *usquam* the only objection to this understanding of the passage. The only parallel that has been cited for this use is found in *Eun.* 293, *Neque virgost usquam neque ego*, but here the local force with which the word is first introduced is the warrant, as it affords the opportunity for the turn. Negative adverbs of place, however, and equivalent adverbial expressions are not uncommon in this signification, e.g. *nullo loco*, οὐδαμοῦ.

There may well be, then, two ways of thinking with regard to the objection urged on the score of usage against the traditional interpretation of this passage, but as to the strength of the position taken by Dziatzko against the logical inconsequence of that interpretation there can be no question. Sannio is to be made to feel that he is in great danger of suffering a total loss; there is no longer any thought of reassuring him, and with *age novi tuom animum* the work of intimidating him begins. *quasi...obsequare* is plainly a threat, and another is conveyed by implication in *praeterea...Cyprum.* It is strange that with this definite notion of the meaning to be conveyed and with but the single word *obsequare* not making for that meaning, Dziatzko should have been unable to hit upon a satisfactory emendation.

Is not the passage as it stands capable of interpretation as he would have it interpreted? The effect sought for may be obtained as well by making *dum...obsequare* refer to the future as by substituting a word that will represent the actual present state of affairs. In other words, we have a clause denoting time 'contemporaneous in limit,' and not a proviso, as we have supposed it on the authority of Donatus; and the subjunctive is anticipatory or due to subordination to *sint.*

Syrus has taken upon himself the task of persuading Sannio that he will do well to accept what the girl cost him, and he accomplishes his purpose by threatening the procurer with the loss even of this, and by letting him see that his intended departure for

Cyprus is known and has been counted upon to make him more complaisant. 'As if you were at all sure of the twenty minae (as if you would ever get the twenty minae) until you come to terms with Aeschinus. And besides, it is currently reported that you are on the point of departure for Cyprus.'

J. C. KIRTLAND, JUNR.
Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y.

RIESE'S *ANTHOLOGIA LATINA*.

Anthologia Latina. Ediderunt FRANCISCUS BUECHELER et ALEXANDER RIESE. Teubner 1894–7. M. 17. 70.

WE have here a second edition of the first portion of Riese's *Anthologia Latina*, followed by a gathering which Buecheler has made of the metrical inscriptions, thus accomplishing for Latin what Kaibel has done for Greek. The labour expended on the work has been vast; to praise it would be almost impertinent; to criticise it, or even to convey any adequate idea of it, within the narrow limits of a review, is impossible. It will be an indispensable adjunct to any first-hand study of Latin. In whatever portion of the field a scholar may be toiling, he will find matter for consideration in these volumes. The co-operation of many scholars for a long time to come, will be needed in order to arrive at a full understanding of these *carmina*. Every practised Latinist who reads them with attention may expect to solve some difficulties which have baffled others. Buecheler has achieved his task as no other living man could have achieved it. But much remains to be done, and the words of Aristotle apply: δόξει ἂν παντὸς εἶναι προαγαγεῖν καὶ διαρθρῶσαι τὰ καλῶς ἔχοντα τῇ περιγραφῇ. There is indeed much that is fatiguing, even repulsive to read in these *carmina*, but he who perseveres will be amply repaid.

Riese has given full consideration to the criticisms of the poems contained in the *Anthologia* which have appeared since the date of his first edition. Naturally, the influence of Baehrens has been great, perhaps too great. It is much to be regretted that the editor has not given references to the journals or works in which the criticisms quoted by him have been published. This would have cost him little labour, and the reader who wishes to hunt up the original articles must waste time hugely for want of clues. Also, the abbreviations used are not clearly set forth. Those who read the volume for the first time will often be puzzled by them. And it is a pity that the passages of classical writers imitated by these late poets have been so very rarely noted. Buecheler supplies far more help of the kind. The text of the verses is on the whole very corrupt, and there is still a wide field for criticism. I append comments on a few passages, quoting the poems by the numbers which Riese gives them.

11, ll. 64, 5. The poet compares Hippodamia, who is standing close by her father and Pelops, to a precious stone set in gold:

qualis gemma micat, fuluum quae diuidit aurum,
inter utramque uiam talem se laeta ferebat.

The words *utramque uiam* must surely have been corrupted from *utrumque uirum*. The codex Salmasianus indeed gives *utrumque*.

21, ll. 204, 210:

hoc sapiens Furia, Venus inuida, Iuno cruenta.....
quod furor exposcit demens, quod praelia saeua.

The whole piece is curious; it is a versification of a rhetorical controversy, of the kind with which we are familiar from the rhetorician Seneca and the pseudo-Quintilian. In the lines quoted *hoc* and *quod* refer to *aurum*. In the first of the two lines I would read *sacuiens* for *sapiens* and in the second *demensque in praelia sacuit*. The writer is much given to repeating himself, and l. 210 echoed l. 204. As to the scansion of *saeuiens* as a spondee, it hardly calls for illustration in so late a writer. But I would refer to Lucretius 5,396, a line which both in A and in B runs thus:

ignis enim superauit et ambens multa perussit;

but B has the correction *lambens*, which Lachmann adopted, changing *superauit* to

superāt; wherein he has been followed by subsequent editors. Of the reading *ambiens*, in older editions, Lachmann only says that the verse does not permit it. The metrical question, I am convinced, ought not to be dismissed in so summary a fashion; but to debate it here would take me too far afield. The reading *ambiens* receives support from passages in two imitators of Lucretius, who employ *ambire* in connexion with fire: Arnobius 2, 30 (a chapter in which there is much reminiscence of Lucretius) licet omnibus ambiatur flammis torrentium fluminum; and Minucius Felix, *Oct.* 35, 1 ambientis ardoris. In Buecheler's collection, no. 197 (*C. I. L.* viii. 1070) we have

ita leuis incumbat terra denuncio tibi . . . .
rogo ne sepulcri umbras uiolare audeas.

Buecheler corrects *denuncio* to *defuncto*. But the scansion of *denuncio* is similar to that of *saeuiens*, (cf. *acquiesceret* in 165, l. 3) and *ita* is explained by the *ne-* clause, while *incumbat* is directly dependent on *denuncio*.

198, ll. 59, 60:

aufer, iners monitor, turpis fomenta medellae.

The subject of the poem is 'Achilles in parthenone,' when he hears the trumpet of Diomede. He imagines a speech by a bad adviser who warns him against going to Troy, and he replies in the words quoted. But what is the meaning of *turpis medellae?* The word *medellae* appears to derive from an original *medullae*.

276, ll. 3, 4:

inuidia excelsos, inopes iniuria uexat:
quam felix uiuit quisquis utroque caret!

Riese, with Lessing, alters *utroque* to *utraque*, quite unnecessarily. All Latin neuter pronouns used substantivally may have reference to nouns of any number or gender. This use is especially common in the case of the phrases *in eo*, *in quo*, *in utroque*, where the reference is often to feminine nouns; but editors frequently emend without cause. So in Cic. *Off.* 2, 52 *in utroque* in a good many texts is changed to *in utraque*.

291, ll. 7, 8:

sic famem gestu loquaci et mitiori uertice
discit ille quam sit aptum uentris arte uincere.

Riese puts an obelus before *uertice*, and says *non intellegitur*. The subject is a tame fish, which like the fish of Hortensius and Lucullus, 'postulat cibos diurnos ore piscis paruolo | nec manum fugit uocatus nec pauescit retia.' It apparently makes gestures with its mouth or head when it is hungry. Seemingly *mitiori* should be changed to *mutiori*, which gives a contrast with *loquaci*. The word *arte* is also corrupt. Read *uentris arta*, 'the straits of hunger'; thus *famem gestu loquaci uincere* and *mutiori uertice uentris arta uincere* exactly correspond.

376, ll. 7, 8:

uirtus forma decus animus sensusque uirilis,
inuigilans animo sollers super omnia sensus.

The lines occur in a eulogy upon Thrasamundus, king of Libya. Riese obelizes *sensus*. But the very structure of the two lines shows the word to be correct; the second line is intended to repeat *sensus* from the first, as well as *animus*. The meaning 'good judgment,' 'good sense,' is satisfactory enough. The word is thus eulogistically employed on sepulchral inscriptions, as in 29 and 81 of the 'carmina epigraphica.'

Buecheler's collection opens with the song of the Arval brethren. If an account were written of the proposals for change in the text of this hymn, which have been made by eminent scholars, it would have a curious interest and would enforce, by sheer repulsion, a lesson in sobriety. Buecheler's treatment of it is eminently conservative. He considers that the famous inscription in which, in rough Saturnians, Mummius celebrates the capture of Corinth, is not the original, but a copy made at a comparatively late date. In the epitaph of the 'filios Barbati,' the addition of *uiroro* at the end of the second line ('duonoro optumo fuise uiro') is decisively rejected, and also the addition of *clasid* at the end of the fifth line, formerly proposed by the editor. As regards the inscription in honour of Scipio Barbatus himself, the view of Ritschl and Mommsen is accepted, that it is not older than the time of the son: 'patri post filii mortem hoc elogium obtigisse quo parem cum filio honorem haberet.' Hazardous as it is to run in any way counter to the opinion of such a trio, I venture to think that the theory of concoction ab initio is improbable for so early a time. The features of the inscription may be accounted for by supposing that, according to the earliest fashion, it was painted on the stone

in red, and only incised at a later date. The editor says of *Loucanam* in the last line: 'Lucana omisso terrae uocabulo pro Lucania singulare.' Is it any stranger than *continens, Celtica* and many other things of the kind?

63, l. 6:

nomen si quaeras, exoraturi Saluiae.

For *exoraturi* is substituted *exoriatur*, an unlikely word, it seems to me. Read *exoratur*, and for *exorare aliquid* 'to obtain something in answer to an appeal,' compare Propert. 5, 5, 19.

106, l. 1:

uixi beatus dis, amicis, literis.

Rather read uixi beatus, dis amicis, literis. The deceased was θεοφιλής, and ascribes to that fact his success in literature.

207: Sabinus praetor magna res formis perit. The words *magna res* recall Ἰσοκράτους, μέγα πρᾶγμα, μαθητής, and like usages; cf. 1109 'corpore in exiguo res numerosa fui.' Buecheler, I think (the note is a little obscure) construes *formis* with *magna res*, and supposes the praetor to be described as 'powerful in formulae.' This is hardly possible, and we are driven back on the very natural supposition of Gatti that *formis* = *Formiis*.

363: Somnio praemonitus miles hanc ponere iussit aram. The editor says 'poetae licuit somno scribere.' But if MSS. are to be trusted there are many passages in prose writers where *somnus* has the sense of *somnium*.

479: Fata me rapuere mea et me iacio eidus ignotis. Mommsen and others have thought *eidus* corrupt; but Buecheler brilliantly suggests that it is εἰδώς, quoting Homer's ἵνα εἰδότες ἤ κε θάνωμεν ἤ... A fair number of instances may be collected from inscriptions of Greek words thus embedded in Latin; so in 1109 epoi = ἐποίει.

1252 n.: The reference to Cic. *Cluent.* should be 40 not 48.

1273:

ille ego qui uarios cursus uariumque laborem sustinui ut iustas conciliaret opes.

The curious syntax (*conciliaret* for *conciliarem*) may be illustrated from inscriptions, as *C. I. L.* xiv. 2485.

1362, l. 6: hoc quoque non vellet mors licuisse sibi. So Martial 4, 44, 8 nec superi uellent hoc licuisse sibi. There are some other echoes of Martial and a good many of other authors, to which reference is not made in the notes.

1409, l. 4: cui pietas fidei gratia comis erat. I do not comprehend the note 'propter fidem comis.' Seemingly *pietas fidei* (the Christian faith) go together, *pietas* and *gratia* both being subjects to *erat*.

1552, l. 30:

Aegyptos Phariis leuitatibus, artibus actis
Gallia semper ouans.

Buecheler speaks of the great difficulty of *artibus actis*, and after rejecting other explanations, decides that *actis* agrees with *artibus*, *agere artes* being quite possible in the African Latin. It would be better to assume asyndeton and to suppose the words to stand for *artibus et actis*. But I suspect error here. It may be that either the stone-cutter or the transcriber of the inscription should have made the words run *actibus artis* 'the achievements of her art' *i.e.* the art rhetorical, which was the special glory of Gaul. The date of the inscription (second century) accords well with this supposition.

J. S. Reid.

VAN LEEUWEN'S *RANAE*.

Aristophanis Ranae, cum prolegomenis et commentariis, edidit J. F. Van Leeuwen, in Academ. Lugduno-Batava Prof. Ord., *Lugduni Batavorum*, apud A. W. Sijthoff, 1896. M. 6.

This is the third play of Aristophanes which van Leeuwen has edited. The notes to his *Acharnians* (1885) are written in Dutch, but in his edition of the *Vespae* (1893) and in the present volume on the *Ranae* he has appealed to a wider audience by writing Prolegomena and notes in Latin—in Latin which, though at times somewhat fearlessly un-Ciceronian in vocabulary, is always unpedantic and pleasant to read.

The Introduction (pp. i-xx) deals in the main with the argument and composition of

the play. Van Leeuwen believes that the news of the death of Euripides early in 406 suggested to Aristophanes as an argument for a comedy the meeting in Hades between Aeschylus the *μαραθωνομάχης* and the sophistical Euripides and their subsequent contest before Pluto for the primacy of the dramatic art. While the poet was writing a comedy on these lines the death of Sophocles occurred towards the end of 406. 'Sensit tunc comicus eam quam ducebat telam non revellendam quidem sibi esse sed tamen ex parte retexendam (p. vi).' Consequently he remodelled his original scheme by introducing the journey of Dionysus to Hades in search of a good poet. 'Magna autem dexteritate duo haec themata, quorum alterum est: "quis poeta tragicus apud inferos primas feret," alterum: "quis in lucem reducetur," ita coniunxit et permiscuit, ut lector non nimis accurate attendens nullos in fabulae compositione deprehendat rimas (p. viii).' This is an interesting though necessarily unverifiable hypothesis.

The theory first proposed by Stanger in 1870 that there were two editions of the play has not found many adherents. The prose *ὑπόθεσις* states that the play was acted a second time because the parabasis was admired. Van Leeuwen sensibly remarks that this statement is fatal to any theory of two editions. 'Corriguntur—*διασκενάζονται*—fabulae quibus poeta repulsam tulit: quae vero reposcitur comoedia sine mutationibus scenae denuo est committenda (p. viii).' A verse here and there or perhaps a short passage[1] may have been altered, but the play must have remained substantially the same.

The *Adnotatio critica* is the least valuable part of van Leeuwen's otherwise valuable edition. It is to be regretted that he gives no discussion of the relation which the MSS. bear to one another, but this evidently does not enter into the plan of his work. It is still more to be regretted that he follows (to all appearances) the antiquated collations of Bekker. Why this should be I do not know, as he gives no reasons for impugning the accuracy of the more recent collations given by von Velsen in his edition of 1881. I append a list of the discrepancies which I have noted,—von Velsen's report of the Ravennas being in each case confirmed by a collation of that MS. in my possession:

57 '*ἀτταταί* (*ἀττατάτ* pauci) codd.' R reads *ἀππαπαι*, V *αππαπαῖ*.

245 '*πολυκολύμβοις* codices.' R, V and *Suidas* read *πολυκολύμβοισι*.

286 '*(ε)'στιν*] *'στ'* alii, om. V, R alii.' R reads *'στιν*.

488 '*γ'αὖτ'* R.' V also reads *γ'αὖτ'*.

748 '*ἀπίης* Kuster] *ἀπῆς* codd.' R reads *ἀπίης*.

844 '*θερμήνη(ι)* M.' If M = *Ambrosianus* L. 39 (VL gives no list of the sigla he employs) von Velsen gives its reading as *θερμήνης*.

889 '*θεοί* VA].' V reads *θεοῖς*.

911 '*τιν' ἂν* Dobree] *τινα* codd.' V reads *τιν' αν*.

1182 '*εὐδαίμων*] *εὐτυχής* VR.' R reads *εὐδαίμων*.

1448 '*σωθείμεν* V].' V reads *σωθείημεν*.

Some of these inaccuracies are not due to Bekker.

The text is divided into acts and scenes, and stage directions, often very happily conceived, are supplied. Conjectures are freely admitted, and the evidence of ISS has been followed in such forms as *ἀνύτω*, *ἀνύσας*, *Τειθράσιαι* (477). Crasis is nearly everywhere avoided. In this I do not quite grasp the principle that van Leeuwen has followed. In 80 he prints *καὶ ἄλλως*, but in 1060 *κἄλλως* (as in *Vespae* 1357), in 34 *ἠτἂν*. I do not see that there is much to be gained by the omission, since according to Meisterhans,[2] p. 56, the evidence of ISS is pretty evenly balanced. The *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* is very conveniently marked where it occurs, *e.g.* *εἰς Μακ...άρων εὐωχίαν*. I subjoin a few criticisms upon the notes:—

103 *σὲ δὲ ταῦτ' ἀρέσκει* codd. VL suggests *σοὶ ταῦτ'* on the ground that this is the only clear instance of *ἀρέσκω* with acc. in Aristophanes. All other apparent instances contain an elided *μ'*, which is not an accusative but a dative. It may be historically correct that *ταῦτά μ' ἀρέσκει* originally meant *ταῦτά μ(οι) ἀρέσκει*, but it must soon have been taken for an acc., and the phrase may have formed the starting point for the construction with the acc. which is so frequent in Plato and Thuc.

108–115. VL punctuates *μίμησιν·* and *Κέρβερον.* in place of the usual commas. Surely this speech of Dionysus is of the nature of what we should call 'patter,' *i.e.* it was delivered in one breath, winding up with the long catalogue which flabbergasts Hercules and makes him reply *ὦ σχέτλιε*.

168 *τῶν ἐκφερομένων ὅστις ἐπὶ τοῦτ' ἔρχεται.* I do not feel sure that this verse is interpolated. I certainly mistrust the reason

[1] Cf. Tucker's plausible explanation of the difficulties in 1435 sq. in the July number of this Review. VL's suggestion that part of this passage is interpolated from the *Demi* of Eupolis seems to me very farfetched.

given by VL, 'arguit enim interpolatorem verbum ἔρχεται quod Attice non *it* sed *venit* significat.' It surely means *ire* in *Ran.* 301, ἴθ' ᾗπερ ἔρχει and in *Thesm.* 485 εἰς τὸν κοπρῶν' οὖν ἔρχομαι. βάδιζέ νυν.

169 *D.* ἐὰν δὲ μὴ εὕρω. *X.* τότ' ἐμ' ἄγειν.

VL adopts Ritschl's ἔχειν for ἄγειν. I see no reason why the MS. reading should not be kept and translated, 'Then take me'?—cf. 190 δοῦλον οὐκ ἄγω.

170 ἔκβαιν'...ἀπόδος τὸν ναῦλον.

VL adopts Halbertsma's ἀποδοὺς. I find more humour in the passage if the MS. reading is kept. Dionysus lands and attempts to move away without paying his fare. Charon shouts after him ἀπόδος τὸν ναῦλον!

301*a* VL gives to Dionysus instead of to Xanthias. In this suggestion he has been anticipated by Piccolomini, *Studi FG* 1882. The change seems to improve the passage.

308 ὁδὶ δὲ δείσας ὑπερεπυρρίασε σοῦ. Bakhuyzen's explanation that ὁδὶ = ὁ πρωκτός, and that Dionysus κατατιλᾷ ἑαυτὸν, seems right. The slave lifts up the κροκωτός. VL extends this by making ὁδὶ = ὁ κροκωτός. My only objection to this is that it must have been somewhat difficult to represent the event on the stage in so graphic a manner.

369 τούτοις αὐδῶ < the reading of *Aulus Gellius.* ἀπαυδῶ codd.>καὖθις ἀπαυδῶ
καὶ τὸ τρίτον μάλ' ἀπαυδῶ
ἐξίστασθαι μύσταισι χοροῖς.

VL adopts Blaydes' πρωυδῶ in place of the thrice repeated ἀπαυδῶ. But surely the more regular construction ἀπαυδῶ μὴ is not grossly violated here, owing to the implied negative in ἐξίστασθαι, ἀπαυδῶ ἐξίστασθαι = ἀπαυδῶ μὴ ἐφίστασθαι.

593 VL reads ἀνανεάζειν<σοβαρὸν ὄντα>. The ὄντα sounds very weak, and is not much better than Meineke's<πρὸς τὸ σοβαρὸν>.

609 *Aeac.* εἶεν, καὶ μάχει;
ὁ Διτύλας χὠ Σκεβλύας χὠ Παρδόκας
χωρεῖτε δευρὶ καὶ μάχεσθε τουτῳί.

VL adopts Naber's λάβεσθε τουτονί for μάχεσθε τουτῳί to the detriment of the passage. μάχεσθε forcibly echoes the preceding μάχει, 'You mean to show fight, do you? Here, Ditylas, etc., come and show the fellow how to fight.'

655 *Aeac.* ἐπεὶ προτιμᾷς γ' οὐδέν; *Dion.* οὐδέν μοι μέλει.
Aeac. βαδιστέον τἄρ' ἐστιν ἐπὶ τονδὶ πάλιν.

VL says 'particula ἐπεὶ huic loco vix apta ...An εἶτ' οὐ προτιμᾷς οὐδέν; The passage does not require the knife, but only an alteration in the punctuation. Aeacus' speech is really continuous: ἐπεὶ προτ. γ' οὐδὲν—<Dionysus (interrupting), οὐδέν μοι μέλει>—βαδιστέον τἄρ' ἐστιν κτἑ.

839 VL's suggestion, ἀπορολάλητον for ἀπερι. has been anticipated by Ribbeck, *Rh. M.* 1894.

1119 βιβλίον τ' ἔχων ἕκαστος
μανθάνει τὰ δεξιά.

VL thinks these lines refer to the second representation of the play, 'cum primo acta est fabula fuere inter spectatores...qui nimis doctam esse quererentur, intellectu enim difficile esse locos crebros ubi ad varias Aeschyli et Euripidis tragoedias alluderetur.' So at this second performance they solemnly provided themselves with handbooks to the play, in which they could look up the references to the passages parodied. I give the Athenians credit for more humour. It must have been as bad as looking up the references in Eber's novels. Why should the passage be more than (as it is usually interpreted) a compliment to the increased education of the Athenians owing to the increase in books about this time? We are always hearing of Euripides' library. 'Every body has his book' was a phrase something like our 'the schoolmaster is abroad.'

The book is well printed—the type used in the introduction is especially pleasing—and contains few misprints. A list of the few I have noticed may be useful for a second edition:—

P. 5, last line of metrical ὑπόθεσις, read Εὐριπίδην; line 51 (note) ἑστιώμεθα; l. 308 (note) inficete; l. 607 (note) οὐκ ἐς κόρακας ἀποφθερεῖτον seems doubtful Greek; l. 944 (note) in the fragment quoted, τραγῳδίαν should surely be marked as a conjecture if it is intended to replace the MS. reading μελῳδίαν; l. 1004 (note) read οἰκοδομήσας; l. 1349 (note) *glomus* as a masc. noun has hardly survived Bentley's note on Hor. *Epp.* i. 13, 14. There are minor misprints in the notes to 295, 216 and on p. 110 [Aristot.] Rep. Ath. is printed, while p. 111 gives Aristot. Rep. Ath.

F. W. Hall.

Westminster.

KIRKLAND'S EDITION OF HORACE.

Horace, Satires and Epistles. Edited on the basis of Kiessling's edition, by JAMES H. KIRKLAND, Ph. D. Boston: Leach, Shewell and Sanborn, 1893. Pp. xxiii, 399. $1.20.

THIS edition of the *Satires* and *Epistles* all students of Horace will gladly welcome. It is one of the volumes of 'The Students' Series of Latin Classics,' published under the general supervision of Prof. Pease of the Leland Stanford Junior University, and Prof. Peck of Columbia University. The aim of this series is to furnish editions 'of the Latin authors that are usually read in American schools and colleges.' The series thus appeals primarily to college students. Prof. Kirkland's purpose, as set forth in his preface, is 'to supply the student more liberally than has heretofore been done in American editions with such information as is needed for the full understanding and enjoyment' of Horace. To the attainment of this end some of the *Satires* and *Epistles* have been left without annotation in order that space might be gained for a fuller treatment of the others. The full text, however, is given in every case. The Introduction treats, among other things, of the history of Roman satire prior to Horace, of the characteristics of Horatian satire, of the language of the *Satires* and *Epistles*, and of the metre. When the book comes to a second edition, that portion of the Introduction which deals with pre-Horatian satire will need revision in the light of Prof. Hendrickson's article on 'The Dramatic Satura and the Old Comedy at Rome,' in the *Amer. Journ. of Philol.*, XV, pp. 1–30. The sections on the language are particularly good. Attention has been called by others *e.g.* by Palmer in his edition and by F. Barta in two special pamphlets, to the fact that, in the *Satires* especially, Horace repeatedly uses words and phrases borrowed from the *sermo plebeius*, or at least, from the looser and less conventional language of every-day conversation. In no previous edition, however, so far as I am aware, was this subject worked out in detail. Prof. Kirkland has thus done a real service in making the results of special investigations in this interesting and important field accessible to the ordinary student.

The commentary is in general happy, and well fulfils the purpose which the author had in view. Not only have the editors of Horace been studied, but articles on specia points in the various learned journals have been consulted. The notes are not cumbersome, and extraneous matters are usually excluded. If there is any error here at all, it is at times on the side of brevity. Though his work is confessedly based on Kiessling's edition, Prof. Kirkland everywhere shows independence of judgment, differing from Kiessling not infrequently, and often, to my mind, rightly. A notable instance may be found in the introductory note to *Sat.* i. 5, in which Kirkland advocates the date 38 B.C. as against the spring of 37, vigorously upheld by Kiessling. Some of the points in which I should be most inclined to take issue with Prof. Kirkland are the very ones in which he follows Kiessling most closely. A case in point is *Sat.* i. l. 36, *simul inversum contristat Aquarius annum* (see this *Review*, February, 1896, p. 31). There are many good notes, also, not suggested at all by Kiessling's commentary.

The editor has frequently referred to general works like Becker's *Gallus*,[1] or Marquardt's *Privatleben*. It would seem that in editions intended primarily for the use of college students there should be a page set apart for a brief description of all the works cited (giving date and place of publication, price, etc.), as well as of the abbreviations employed in citing them. The list in part I., pp. xvii–xx, of Lanman's *Sanskrit Reader* indicates just what I mean. For English speaking students references to Lanciani's *Ancient Rome* would have been useful in a number of places.

Some special points may now be noted. On p. xii correct the reference to *Ep.* 2. 222 to read *Ep.* 2. 2. 22; in the text at *Sat.* i. 1. 44 add a question mark at the end of the line. In the note on *Sat.* i. 1. 108 *ut avarus* is treated as an explanatory phrase with causal force, and *ut male sanos*, *Epp.* i. 19. 3, is cited as a parallel. In the note on the latter passage, however, *ut* is rightly taken as *ex quo, ever since*. On *Sat.* ii. 1. 34 we read, 'according to Jerome's chronology (see on *S.* 1. 4. 6), Lucilius was only 46 years old when he died . . . .' Yet in the note on *Sat.* 1. 4. 6, though the dates of the birth and death of Lucilius are given, nothing whatever is said of Jerome's chronology. On *Sat.* i. 9. 36 *vadato* is described as an

[1] Cited, without comment, from the latest German revision.

impersonal ablative absolute, and *parto*, *Sat.* i. 1. 94, and *excepto*, *Epp.* i. 10. 50, are cited as parallels. In truth, these participles are in a wholly different construction, as Prof. Kirkland saw when he wrote his note on *Epp.* 1. 10. 50. On *Epp.* ii. 1. 60 the statement is made that Pompey's theatre 'had room for forty thousand spectators.[1]' Friedlaender, in Marquardt's *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, iii.[2] 531, states that Pompey's theatre had space for 17,580 persons, that of Balbus for 11,510 and that of Marcellus for about 20,000. On *Sat.* i. 4. 71 it is stated that 'Book-shops were often situated in some *porticus*, on the columns of which . . . lists of the books for sale were written.' Is this true? At any rate, neither the *Ars Poetica*, 372, nor Mart. i. 117, to which alone Prof. Kirkland refers, proves any such thing. Martial's words, taberna scriptis *postibus* hinc et inde totis, omnes ut cito perlegas poetas, point to a totally different view, that, for instance, advocated by Overbeck, *Pompeii*,[4] p. 379. On *Sat.* i. 4. 129 ex hoc ego sanus ab illis perniciem quaecumque ferunt, *sanus ab* is compared with *aeger ab animo, valere ab oculis*, which seem hardly parallel, since in *sanus ab* the separative force is clearly recognizable, whereas in the other phrases it has virtually disappeared. On *Sat.* i. 10. 21 Prof. Elmer's paper[2] in the *Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 1892, pp. xviii.-xxiii., might have been consulted and referred to. A note bringing together all the passages in both *Satires* and *Epistles* that show reminiscences of Lucretius, as well as an explanation of the causes which led Horace to the careful study of that author would have been both interesting and valuable (cf. *e.g.* the paper entitled *De Horatio Lucretii Imitatore*, by Ad. Weingaertner, in the *Dissertationes Philologicae Halenses* ii, 1-50.)

Finally, some misprints and errors in citations may be noted. In note on *Sat.* i. 1. 58 correct reference to *Od.* 4. 9. 2; on *Sat.* i. 4. 139 read *inludunt* for *includunt*; *Sat.* 1. 5. 3 correct Strabo 5,23 to 5,233; on i. 5. 16 read viator for viatore. On *Sat.* i. 5. 38 the reference should be to *Sat.* i. 10. 81, on i. 5. 59 to v. 62, not v. 2, on *Sat.* i. 6. 23. to *Epp.* i. 6. 37, on *Sat.* i. 6. 27 to *Sat.* i. 5. 36, on *Epp.* i. 1. 37 to Ov. *Fast.* iv. 315 (not 41. 313), on *Epp.* i. 1. 45 to *Sat.* i. 1. 30, on *Epp.* i. 2. 60 to *Aen.* i. 8, on *Epp.* i. 7. 94 to *Aen.* ii. 141, on *Epp.* ii. 2. 95 to *Epp.* i. 7. 32, on *Epp.* ii. 2. 126 to *Sat.* ii. 5. 71. In the note on *Sat.* i. 9. 6 Ter. *Eun.* ii. 3. 50. 51 is cited in a badly garbled form, owing to lack of proper punctuation; the note on Epp. i. 2. 32 is due to a careless copying of Kiessling. Lastly, on p. 322 read *laedat* for *laedit*, and *artibus* for *altibus*.

CHARLES KNAPP.

Barnard College.

[1] The same statement is made by Prof. Elmer, in his recent edition of the *Phormio*, p. xxix, and by Middleton, *Remains of Ancient Rome*, II, 65.

[2] Cf. this *Review*, vi. p. 324 *b*.

MOULTON AND GEDEN'S CONCORDANCE TO THE GREEK TESTAMENT.

A Concordance to the Greek Testament according to the Texts of Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf and the English Revisers, edited by the Rev. W. F. MOULTON and Rev. A. S. GEDEN. Pp. xii., 1037. Price 26*s.* net. Clark. 1897.

THE need of a concordance adapted to the best critical texts of the G. T. has long been felt, and the gratitude of all scholars is due to the editors who have undertaken the arduous task of revising Bruder's well-known book on this principle. It is much to be regretted, however, that the senior editor, to whom students of the G. T. are so much indebted for his excellent edition of *Winer's Grammar*, should have been prevented by illness from taking his full share in the work of revision. I propose here to mention the main differences, independent of the Text, which are to be found between the old Bruder and the new Concordance, noticing by the way any points in which it seems to me that there is still room for further improvement. I will call the former B and the latter M.

M adds diacritical marks, to denote (*a*) that a word is not to be found in the Greek versions of the O.T. including the Apocrypha, (*b*) that it *is* found in one or other of these versions, but *not* in the LXX. version of the canonical Hebrew Scriptures, (*c*) that it is not in classical use. The addition of these marks is a decided advantage, but I think the line of demarcation between classical and non-classical is somewhat arbi-

trarily fixed at the Christian era. If there *is* a non-classical writer it is Polybius. Surely the main factor in the change was the Macedonian conquest, with the consequent submerging of the Attic in the common Greek. I a little doubt also the importance of distinguishing between classes (*a*) and (*b*). It is of course impossible to avoid slight inaccuracies in bestowing such marks. Some are corrected in p. 1035; one which is still uncorrected is *ἀποσκίασμα*, which is not distinguished as non-classical, though it is first used by St. James and does not occur again before the fourth century A.D.

The quotations are given more fully in M than in B: sometimes indeed with almost unnecessary fulness; but in such a passage as Matt. 22, 37 it is a great improvement to have the full phrase *ἀγαπήσεις Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας σου*, instead of the abbreviated *ἀγαπήσεις Κύριον* of B, which makes it difficult to understand the following note '*ἐν* LXX. *ἐξ* Deut. 6, 5.' Compare also B's unintelligible quotation on *ἀγαπάω* (Joh. 19, 26) *μαθητὴν παρ. ὃν ἠγάπα*, and on *ἀδικία* (Rom. 6, 13) *ὅπλα ἀδικίας τῇ ἁμ.*, with M's *ἰδὼν...τ. μαθητὴν παρεστῶτα ὃν ἠγάπα*, and *μηδὲ παριστάνετε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὅπλα ἀδικίας*.

M gives the Hebrew of all quotations from the O.T., B gives the LXX. where it differs from the N.T. It might be well to give both. B also gives the Hebrew of all proper names.

B gives various readings from important MSS., M gives only the variations of the three texts mentioned in the Title. It would, I think, have been well to notice the more remarkable variations in the chief MSS., *e.g.* such a word as *παραβάτης* in D.'s addition to Luke 6, 4, or the reading *ἀηδία* in L. 23, 12. Sometimes the notation seems to stand in need of explanation, *e.g.* under *ἀδελφός*, Mt. 12, 47, we read '—h.v. [T] WH non mg,' which is likely to cause perplexity to youthful readers.

As regards the saving of space by omission of words or examples, M goes much further than B, omitting *καί* and *δέ* entirely, while B gives all the passages in which *δέ* occurs, and all examples of *καί* (filling pp. 453—475) which are not simply copulative. The only other omissions in B are under *ὁ, ἡ, τό*, which still occupies pp. 580—604, and under the relative *ὅς, ἥ, ὅ*, occupying pp. 618—623; while M devotes less than nine pages to the former, and for the most part, both under the article and the relative, gives references only, without quoting. It is the same with *ἀλλά, ἀπό, γάρ, εἰς, ἐν, ἐκ*, and many other indeclinable words, in which I confess that I find the list of references far less satisfactory than the actual quotations, though I agree that we are overdone with examples of simple *δέ* in B. But a mere statement of the different uses of *καί* distinguished by B, will show at what a cost of valuable matter M's economy of space has been purchased. B gives here (1) examples of *ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ*, (2) such uses as *πολλὰ καὶ ἕτερα*, (3) a rather loose heading '*καὶ rhetoricae indolis*,' under which we find quoted *αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται*, (4) *οὔτε...καί*, (5) '*καὶ ubi alii ἤ exhibent*,' (6) *καὶ...καί*, (7) *καί in oratione historica ex simplici Hebraeorum narrandi modo*, (8) *καί* followed by a particle of time, (9) following a notice of time, (10) logical use, (11) *καὶ ἐπεξεγητικόν*, (12) *καί=porro*, (13) *καί=etiam*, (14) *καί* following *ὡς* or *καθώς*. Again, under *δέ*, it is a pity to have lost the exx. of *δέ in apodosi*, and *δέ tertio, quarto, quinto loco positum*. Surely if it was desired to save space it would have been better to omit the endless repetitions of *ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν, ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν* or the 39 exx. of *ἐγενήσεν* in Matt. i., than entirely to ignore these important distinctions in the uses of *καί* and *δέ*.

I proceed to compare some of the headings in which the more remarkable uses of a word are classified. These may be divided into inflexional and syntactical. In regard to inflexions, it seems to be unnecessary to specify any which are not either unusual in form or distinctive in meaning, like the transitive and intransitive tenses of *ἵστημι*: and no form should be specified unless it actually occurs. In all these respects I think both B and M are unsatisfactory, the latter rather the worse of the two. Thus under *βάλλω* M has *ἔβαλα*, but the only instance is *ἔβαλαν* in Acts 16, 37, and we have no right to assume that the principle of analogy which gave birth to the one must have been strong enough to evoke the other: under *ἔχω* it has *εἶχα*, but the only instances are *εἶχαν* and *εἴχαμεν*: under *ἔρχομαι* it has *ἦλθα* (and so *εἰσῆλθα*) though no instance of the 1st sing. is cited. On the other hand under *ἀφίημι* no notice is taken of the unusual forms *ἀφεῶνται* L. 5. 20, 7. 48, *ἤφιεν* Mk. 1. 24, *ἀφεῖς* Apoc. 2. 20, *ἀφίομεν* L. 11. 4, *ἀφίουσιν* Apoc. 11. 9, nor of *ἀνέπεσαν* under *ἀναπίπτω*, nor of *ἐξεστάκεσαν* under *ἐξίστημι*, nor of *φάγομαι* under *ἐσθίω* (though *ἔσθω* is given), nor of *εἰσελήλυθαν* under *εἰσέρχομαι*, nor of *οἴδασιν*, nor of *κάθου*; yet the ordinary

forms *ἐβουλήθην, γνούς, διδόασιν, ἐδίδοσαν*, are specified under their respective verbs.

Turning now to syntactical uses and phrases I do not find any decided superiority in M over B. On the one hand, M is better under *ἄνθρωπος*, where it alone particularizes the phrase *κατὰ ἄνθρ.*, under *ἅγιος*, where it specifies (1) *πνεῦμα ἁγ.*, (2) *τὸ ἅγιον, τὰ ἅγια*, (3) *ὁ ἁγ. τοῦ θεοῦ*, (4) *ἅγιοι*, against B's solitary *τὸ ἅγιον, τὰ ἅγια*; under *αἰών*, where it specifies (1) *ὁ νῦν αἰών, ὁ αἰ. οὗτος*, (2) *ὁ αἰὼν ὁ μέλλων, ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, (3) *εἰς τ. αἰῶνα, τ. αἰῶνας*, (4) *εἰς τ. αἰῶνας τ. αἰώνων*, (5) *ἀπ' αἰῶνος*, of which the last three are omitted in B; and under *βλέπω*, where B omits the important use *βλέπετε μή*. On the other hand, B has the advantage under *ἀπό*, in specifying *ἀπὸ μακρόθεν, ἀπὸ ἄνωθεν*, and in giving the full phrase *ἀπὸ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν*, of which M only gives the first part *ἀπὸ ὁ ὤν*, the abbreviation being all the more mischievous, because only references follow, without quotations. Again under *ἀποδίδωμι*, where B distinguishes between the active and middle voices with their divergent meanings, M has simply '(1) absol., (2) *ἀπ. ὅρκον, λόγον*.' Of (1) he gives such examples as *ἀπόδος εἴ τι ὀφείλεις*, which I see no reason for separating from *ὁ πατὴρ ἀποδώσει σοι*, or *ἀποδώσει ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν πρᾶξιν*: under (2) he combines two phrases which cannot be said to throw much light on one another, 'to render an account' and 'to perform an oath.' Under *ἀποκρίνομαι* M omits the useful distinction which occurs in B '*initio orationis nulla interrogatione antecedente*'; under *ἀρχή* it omits the adverbial use of the accusative; under *ὁ αὐτός* it omits the construction with the dative, of which we have an example in 1 Cor. 11, 5. Other cases in which the classification of uses seems to me defective are *γίνομαι*, where nothing is said of the construction with the infinitive, so common in St. Luke, or with another finite verb. Instead of these, we have the quite insignificant heads '(1) γ. *ὡς*, (2) *seq. dat.*' Under *εἰ* and *εἰ μή* it is a pity to have omitted B's head *c. subj.*, while keeping *c. opt.*, and inserting *c. subj.* under *εἴ τις*. Under *εἰ μή* it would have been well to have distinguished between its use with, or without a verb, the latter being far the commoner in the G.T. Under *ἔξεστιν* M has *seq. accus.* which gives a wrong impression unless we add *cum infinitivo*. Under *ἀρνέομαι*, for the very illogical heads '(1) *c. accus.*, (2) *ἀρν. τ. πίστιν*,' read (1) *ἀρν. τινα*, (2) *ἀρν. τι*. Under *ἐπικαλέω* such dissimilar phrases as *ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσηται τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου σωθήσεται* and *ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς* are put in the same category. Under *ἄν* M has (1) *ἕως ἄν*, (2) *ὃς ἄν*, (3) *ὅστις ἄν*, (4) *c. indic.*, (5) *c. opt.*, (6) *ὅσοι ἄν*, (7) *ὅπως ἄν*, (8) *ὡς ἄν*, (9) *ἄν τις, ἄν condit.* This again is anything but a logical division. It would be far more natural to divide as follows, (*a*) *ἄν* in principal clause, (1) *c. ind.*, (2) *c. opt.*; (*b*) *ἄν* in subordinate clause, (1) *c. subj.*, (2) *c. ind.* [M puts into the same class *ὅπου ἂν εἰσεπορεύετο* and *πάλαι ἂν μετενόησαν*]; and to arrange M's 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, under *b.* 1: then (*c*) should include elliptical uses, such as some of those cited under *ὡς ἄν*, and (*d*) *ἄν* = *ἐάν*, would correspond to M's 9. Under *αὐτός* I cannot see what purpose is served by specifying *αὐτὸς δέ* and *καὶ αὐτός*, while no notice is taken of the unemphatic use of the nom. *αὐτός*. Under *ἀνά*, instead of M's (1) *ἀνὰ μέσον*, (2) *ἀνὰ εἷς ἕκαστος*, it would have been better to distinguish the local and distributive uses, and name M's (2) as an irregular case of the latter, comparing the similar use of *κατά*.

This may suffice to illustrate the kind of changes which I should desire in the classification of uses. I may mention also that there is nothing to distinguish between proper names and ordinary nouns in the thick black capitals of M, and that the asterisk, obelisk, &c. employed in B to mark the different uses of a word, catch the eye more readily than the figures used in M. I think further that it would be well to make more use of cross reference: *e.g.* *ἄγε* appears as a separate article: I should prefer not to separate it from *ἄγωμεν*: in any case I should refer to it under *ἄγω*. So there should be cross references between *ἀγαθοεργέω* 1 Ti. 6. 18 and *ἀγαθουργέω* Acts 14. 17.

I have only noticed one misprint, *σου* for *σοι* (Mt. 6. 18) under *ἀποδίδωμι*, but there has been quite a fatality in the matter of dropped letters, [Α]*σύνετος*, [Ει]*κῆ*, *Ἄνθρω*-*π*[*ος*].

J. B. Mayor

VON ARNIM'S EDITION OF CHRYSOSTOM.

Dionis Prusaensis, quem vocant Chrysostomum, quae exstant, ed. J. DE ARNIM. Vol. II. Berolini. Weidmann. 1896. 14 M.

MR. VON ARNIM'S estimate of the MS. tradition of the Corpus of Dio's writings, as briefly and clearly stated in the preface to his first volume, may, it appears to me, be regarded as final. I sincerely hope that he may find it possible to devote his industry and insight to the solution of the seemingly more complicated, but allied problem, presented by the tradition of the Plutarchean Corpus.

The main facts determined by the editor are briefly as follows. The Leiden codex M (of which the imperfect Vatican V is a cousin, not a descendant) contains the Corpus of Dio's writings in the order of Photius' Catalogue, and the antiquity of its archetype is thus attested. Derived from a copy of the same archetype (an uncial codex) is the group of MSS. of which the Palatine P is the chief representative. This copy of the archetype was a more accurate and genuine one than that which is the source of MV, since many sound readings which cannot be due to Byzantine correction are found in P where MV offer a corrupt text. Unfortunately when this (P) copy of the archetype was made, the latter was in a mutilated condition, so that for a considerable part of the Corpus, P fails us. Mr. von Arnim's hypothesis that this mutilated state of the archetype is of older date than its perfect state (*i.e.* that parts of it were lost and subsequently recovered) is devised to account for the treatment of the treatise *περὶ φθόνου* (77–78) in M. Only part of it is contained in P, the missing latter part is contained in M but with a new title. It might be possible by the exercise of ingenuity to dispute Mr. von Arnim's conclusion that this and the other lacunae in P are only to be accounted for on the supposition he makes, but it would be certainly futile to do so, as the question of the relative dates at which P and M radiated from the parent tree is quite immaterial.

None of these MSS. are free from interpolation; but the group of MSS. of which the Urbinas (U) is the chief representative, are far more deeply tainted with this vice and, as has happened in the case of other authors, it is from one of this worst group (which has many extant representatives) that the vulgate text of Dio is derived. They contain the treatises, of course, in the received order (which the editor has been wise in preserving), and they all go back to a MS. of the celebrated library of Arethas. The copyist's errors which this group share with M, show that they are derived from a copy of the archetype intermediate between it and M.

On the principle imposed by these facts the editor has constructed his text. Notwithstanding the contributions, in not a few cases very brilliant, made by himself and Professor von Wilamowitz to the emendation of the text, a great deal still remains to be done in this respect, and doubtless will be done, now that conjectural criticism is stimulated by the consciousness that it is not wasting its acumen in trying to reform a text of the facts of the tradition of which it is ignorant. I would recall the notice of the editor to my protest (in a notice of the first volume of this edition) against his too frequent tendency to bracket words and sentences. It may seem to an editor a light and innocuous remedy, but it is one calculated to dull the critical consciousness of a reader, and it is from the casual, but would-be conscientious reader, who approaches an author with his mind full of other things that the best emendations may be expected.

W. R. PATON.

LUPUS'S TRANSLATION OF FREEMAN'S SICILY.

Geschichte Siciliens von EDWARD A. FREEMAN. Deutsche Ausgabe von BERNHARD LUPUS (Leipzig: Teubner. 1895, 1897). Vols. 1, 2. 20 M. each.

THE last work of the late Mr. Freeman has received the compliment of translation into German: it has received the further compliment, not always paid to translated works, of being translated extremely well. Dr. Bernhard Lupus has long been known as an eminent authority on the history of Syracuse in Greek times. In 1885 he issued a monograph on ancient Syracuse: in 1887

he brought out a handy German edition of Cavallari and Orsi's great *Topografia di Siracusa*, and his edition was abridged and adapted with so much skill and scholarship that, except in the matter of maps, it is practically a better book than the splendid but somewhat cumbrous original. Now he has undertaken to translate into German Mr. Freeman's *History of Sicily* and the first two volumes are before me. They correspond to the first two volumes of the English original, that is to say, they carry the reader down to 433 B.C. and end just before the commencement of Athenian interference with the island. The translation, so far as I can judge, is accurate and admirable. The text of the original has been translated tolerably literally, but in the notes and appendices Dr. Lupus has allowed himself a little reasonable liberty and has made occasional corrections and additions, which seem to be distinct improvements in detail, without being numerous or obtrusive enough to alter the character of Freeman's work. The maps have been more freely treated. Their contents, of course, are the same as those of the English maps, but they have been drawn afresh and in one case, the position of Hybla near Megara, a change has been introduced. One of Dr. Lupus' maps is a distinct improvement on the original: it is a map of Selinus in the first volume; in other respects, I should be inclined to say that both the English and the German maps are good and that we might be quite happy with either.

One passage in the second volume concerns me personally. I was rash enough in an earlier number of this review (1889 March) to suggest that the name Achradina belonged properly only to the lower ground round the harbours and not to the hill which makes an eastern end to Epipolae. This Achradina I was inclined to identify with the Outer City of Thucydides. Neither Dr. Lupus writing in Fleckeisen's *Jahrbuch*, nor Mr. Freeman, nor Dr. Lupus translating Mr. Freeman will hear of the suggestion. Nevertheless, I still think that there may be 'something' in it. Achradina, as it is usually mentioned by ancient writers, is on low ground; it is also usually the name of a city-quarter, that is, it denotes inhabited ground, not ground simply. Now the inhabited ground which suits Achradina is undoubtedly the lower ground near the Island and the harbours. The hill-top, or three-quarters of it, shows no traces of having ever been dwelt upon or covered by houses, while the stately buildings which Cicero ascribes to Achradina were undoubtedly, as Mr. Freeman and every one admits, down on the lower ground. Mr. Freeman gets round this difficulty by talking of an Upper Achradina and a Lower Achradina. There is no warrant for such terms either in literature or in topography. It is to be observed that the slope from this lower ground up to the hill-top is gradual, except where quarries have made an artificial cliff. As a friend wrote once to me from Syracuse, there is no spot where you can say 'the brow of "Achradina" begins here,' as you walk up from Ortygia. The distinction between an Upper and a Lower Achradina is, therefore, not a natural one. On the other hand, just for this very reason, I should not wish (as Dr. Lupus supposed me to wish) to limit my Achradina strictly between the quarries and the docks. It extended, I imagine, as far northwards as habitation extended, that is (so far as my evidence serves), not quite up to the word *Grab* in Dr. Lupus' map. The question is, however, a very difficult one, and I must leave it for others to discuss. I have only turned aside to touch upon it here, in order to satisfy my own doubts as to the rightness of the current opinion. This opinion appears to me to agree very inadequately with the facts I have mentioned in these columns and equally inadequately with the facts mentioned by Mr. Freeman. It does not agree at all with the reason given by Thucydides for the construction of the new wall in 415-414 (vi. 75 ὅπως μὴ δι' ἐλάσσονος, etc.). It is needless to add that my heresy on the subject does not in the least diminish my admiratio for Mr. Freeman's book and for the able manner in which Dr. Lupus has made it accessible to German readers.

F. Haverfield.

GEVAERT ON THE SECOND DELPHIC HYMN.

La Mélopée Antique dans le chant de l'église latine. Par Fr. Aug. Gevaert; second appendice. Gand: Ad. Hoste; Oxford: James Parker and Sons. 2*s.*

M. Gevaert has fulfilled the promise made in the work reviewed in these columns (*Class. Rev.* 1896, p. 70), and now presents us with a transcription and discussion of the second hymn discovered at Delphi. His transcription differs only in minute particulars from that of M. Reinach, but in his interpretation of the document he pronounces a more decided opinion than the French scholar on the questions raised by the changes of key etc. in the hymn. He justly condemns M. Reinach's hesitation in deciding between the Dorian and Minolydian modes, the former of which is throughout that of the hymn. The question of mode cannot have been indifferent to the composer, even to the limited extent supposed by M. Reinach. Incidentally M. Gevaert expresses his disagreement (on general grounds) with the views of Mr. Monro (p. 465, note 3). In conclusion he gives an interesting summary of the chief facts which may be learnt from recent discovery as to the methods of ancient composers. We should be disposed, however, to question whether it is so clear as M. Gevaert supposes that the melody of a strophic composition, such as a Pindaric ode, was *necessarily* prior to the words. Such strophes are after all combinations of well-defined rhythmical phrases, only with less regularity than *e.g.* the typical stanzas of Aeolic poetry, to which, no doubt, an infinite variety of melodies might be and were applied. The development of a 'rhythmical idea' into a Pindaric strophe may in some cases at least (the Epode of Pyth. ii. is a good instance) be followed with tolerable certainty, although we associate no melody with the text.

In a second section M. Gevaert discusses and rejects the explanations of the symbol N (or H), appearing in the MSS. of Mesomedes' hymn to the Muse, which have recently been put forward by MM. Van Jan and Reinach, in both cases with justice. He is himself disposed to see in the symbol a corruption of the *instrumental* note ϒ, which he would regard as an indication to the accompanist. There is no objection on melodic grounds to the use of A natural in the passages affected, but the fact that one and the same instrumental note appears in precisely four places, in the absence of any parallel case in the MS. text of the hymns, seems suspicious.

H. Stuart Jones.

THE CLASSICS FOR ITALIAN SCHOOLS.

I tre Poemi, Iliade, Odissea, Eneide, nelle migliori Traduzioni Italiane compendiate in alcune parti; con Note, Studi vari, e Riproduzioni Artistiche, per Uso delle Scuole Medie.

This Italian work will well reward the reader from beginning to end. It is a *compendio* of the original poems only, but the parts are so carefully selected, so aptly, fully and simply joined in the author's own prose, and the guiding idea is so tenaciously, almost enthusiastically carried out to the end, that the wish, that Italy in her need may possess many more such faithful schoolmasters, must be felt by all lovers of the youthful readers whom Prof. Paolo Graziano Clerici is trying to benefit. For, the aim of the commentator in presenting the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, and the *Aeneid*, in this form is, to bring his scholars into more than the superficial touch hitherto possible to them with Homer and Virgil. In Italy, the study of the sciences has narrowed the time allowed for that of the Classics, even where they are still obligatory, so sharply down, 'that the boys can, at most, read but one Book of Virgil and a few hundred lines of Homer.' With these words the author expressed the disappointing results of his best efforts during many years.

This loss, morally and socially considered, at last persuaded the country to direct that a knowledge of the three great Epic Poems

should also be imparted in a summary form from the best Italian Translations, and two years later, in 1891, this compendium appeared accompanied by the approval and praise of literary men, among whom was Ruggiero Bonghi. The second edition was issued this year; it is far superior to the first, containing at the end of each Book useful and appropriate notes of explanation, besides illustrations after photographs of valuable pictures and sculptures belonging to modern, mediaeval and classic times, one from a sarcophagus at Volterra, two from the paintings of Pompei, and others from famous galleries, chiefly of Italy, all welcome to the eye as old friends whom one is glad to meet. Yet the ornamental part of the work is but a happy addition to it; that which strikes the reader most is the thoroughness of the treatment throughout. The parts chosen, the succinct but perfect connection between them in prose, and the Notes, be they etymological interpretations of words like *guiderdone*, moral comments on the allegorical meaning of *Moli*, or astronomical explanations, everything testifies to the vigilance of the author. As regards the choice of the Italian Translations to be used, Prof. Clerici says himself that he could not make a mistake, as he received Instructions, namely Monti's for the *Iliad*, Caro's for the *Aeneid* and either Pindemonte's or Maspero's version for the *Odyssey*. He chose Pindemonte for the first, and Maspero for the last, twelve Books.

Finally the work contains in their right places excursuses on ancient art, on the more difficult mythological questions, on comparative literature, and especially on the connexion of Dante's Divine Comedy with the VIth. Book of *Aeneid*. They are more difficult than the Notes, intended to lead the young readers further, and will afford an intellectual treat to all interested in this subject.

M. H.

FRAGMENTUM CYCLICI INCERTI.

ΒΑCΙΛΕΥC. *ποῖόν σ' ὄχημα πρὸς τάδ' ἤγαγε στέγη;*

ΑΓΓΕΛΟC. *πιστόν γε θεῶν δώρημα, Κενταύρων γένος.*[1]

Β. *ἀλλ' οὐ καθ' ἵππον εἰκάσαι τις ἂν τάχος.*

Α. *οὐχ ἱππόμορφον ἀλλ' ὑφ' Ἡφαίστου τέχνης—*

Β. *κλύων ἐθαύμασ', εἰ τάδ' Ἡφαίστῳ μέλει.*

ΑΓΓΕΛΟC. *σιδηροτεύκτοις μηχαναῖς κυλίν δεται.*

ΒΑCΙΛΕΥC. *οὔκουν ἐρετμοὺς δαιδάλους πτερῶν λέγεις.*

Α. *δισσοὺς γὰρ ἤλασ' αὐτόπους μόνος τροχούς.*

Β. *θεὸς δ' ἐάσει κἀμὲ ταὐτὰ μανθάνειν;*

Α. *πόλει μὲν οὖν ἔχρησε πανδημεὶ κυκλεῖν.*

F. Pollock.

[1] *τὸ τῆς μηχανῆς ὄνομα σημαίνει δηλονότι· πολλῶν τε γὰρ οὐσῶν καὶ καλῶν καὶ πολλαχῶς λεγομένων ἐν ταῖς πρώταις ἐτιμῶντο αἱ ἀπὸ τῶν Κενταύρων ὀνομαζόμεναι.*

ARCHAEOLOGY.

ANCIENT COINS FROM PONDOLAND.

Among a number of bronze Greek and Roman coins belonging to Mr. Thomas Cook, of Messrs. Cook Brothers, Concessionaires of East Pondoland, are some which were found at Fort Grosvenor about four years ago. The site of what had once been a Kaffir hut was being excavated in search of treasure, when, some ten feet below the surface, the diggers came upon a calabash which crumbled away in their hands. It contained three Ptolemaic coins, and some (the owner is unfortunately no longer certain which) of the Roman coins described below. The Ptolemaic coins, which I have classed, so far as their condition per-

mits, according to the attributions given in the British Museum Catalogue of the Coins of the Ptolemies, are as follows :—

Ptolemy I. or II.

1. *Obv.* Head of Zeus to right, laureate.
Rev. [ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ] ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ. Eagle on thunderbolt to left, wings spread. In field, uncertain monograms.
Size 1·1 inches.
Compare B. M. Catalogue, p. 17, No. 29.

Ptolemy II.

2. *Obv.* Head of Zeus to right, laureate.
Rev. ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ. Eagle on thunderbolt to left, wings closed. Between its legs, uncertain monogram.
Size 1·15 inches.
Compare B. M. Catalogue, p. 32, No. 107.

Ptolemy IV.

3. *Obv.* Head of Zeus Ammon to right, diademed. Border of dots.
Rev. ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ. Eagle on thunderbolt to left, wings closed, head reverted ; cornucopiae with fillets on left wing ; between eagle's legs, A or Λ.
Size 1·55 inches.
Compare B. M. Catalogue, p. 66, No. 36.

The Roman coins some of which were found with the Ptolemaic are of very much later date, being all of the period immediately following the reform of Diocletian in A.D. 296. They are as follows :—

Diocletian.

1. *Obv.* IMP C DIOCLETIANVS P F AVG. Head to right, laureate.
Rev. GENIO POPVLI ROMANI. Genius with patera and cornucopiae. In field to right $\frac{A}{I}$, to left XX. In exergue, mintmark ALE.
Cohen, *Monn. fr. sous l'Emp. Rom.*, No. 101.

Maximianus I. Herculeus.

Obv. IMP C M A MAXIMIANVS P F AVG. Head to right, laureate.
Rev. GENIO POPVLI ROMANI. Type of No. 1.
Cohen, No. 184.
Three varieties:—
2. (*a*) In field to right, A. In exergue, ALE.
3. (*b*) In field to right A ; to left, star. In exergue, ALE.
4. (*c*) In field to right, $\frac{S}{V}$; to left K. In exergue, ANT.

Constantius I. Chlorus.

5. *Obv.* FL VAL CONSTANTIVS NOB CAES. Head to right, laureate.
Rev. GENIO AVGG ET CAESARVM NN. Type of No. 1. In exergue KB.
Cohen, No. 58.

Galeria Valeria (wife of Maximianus II).

6. *Obv.* GAL VALERIA AVG. Bust to right, diademed.
Rev. VENERI VICTRICI. Venus standing to left, holding apple in right, and raising veil with left. In field to right $\frac{\Gamma}{P}$; to left, K. In exergue ALE.
Cohen, No. 2.

Maximinus II. Daza.

7. *Obv.* GAL VAL MAXIMINVS NOB CAES. Head to right, laureate.
Rev. GENIO POPVLI ROMANI. Type of No. 1. In field to right H. In exergue ANT.
Cohen, No. 81.
8. Another, *rev.* GENIO CAESARIS. Type of No. 1. In field to left, $\frac{X}{\Delta}$, to r. K. In exergue ALE.
Cohen, No. 40.
9. *Obv.* IMP C GAL VAL MAXIMINVS P F AVG. Head to right, laureate.
Rev. GENIO IMPERATORIS. Type of No. 1. In field to right $\frac{\Gamma}{P}$; to left crescent above K ; in exergue ALE.
Cohen, No. 52.
Of these coins, which must have all been issued between the dates 296 and 313 A.D., Nos. 1–3, 6, 8, and 9 were struck at Alexandria ; Nos. 4 and 7 at Antioch in Syria ; and No. 5 at Cyzicus. The three Ptolemaic coins range between the years 305 and 204

B.C. This gap of over six centuries between the dates of issue of the two groups of coins may seem at first sight to detract from the value of the evidence. But in barbarous districts coins circulate for an almost incredible length of time, and we know that, for instance, Roman coins are at the present day offered in change in parts of the Spanish peninsula. The owner, who was present at the excavation, can testify to the fact that all the Ptolemaic and some of the Roman coins were found together in the circumstances described. It may therefore be supposed that the Ptolemaic coins arrived first in Pondoland, and were afterwards buried in combination with the Roman coins, which from their condition had, with the exception of No. 1, not been in circulation very long. There is nothing astonishing in the fact that in early times coins passed from hand to hand along what is now an important trade route. The daily papers last year had notices (the veracity of which has since been confirmed by personal evidence) of the discovery of a copper coin of Constantine in the same part of the world. Of course the presence of these coins in Pondoland does not imply the presence of Greek or Roman colonists, since coins travel much farther than individuals.

While the nature of our evidence makes it necessary to use all caution in drawing conclusions, it has at least seemed worth while to put the facts, such as they are, on record.

G. F. Hill.

MONTHLY RECORD.

GERMANY.

Wiesbaden.—The excavations on the site of the recently discovered Roman camp at Holzhausen in this neighbourhood have laid bare the four gates with their towers. Over the north-west gate (the *porta sinistra*) an inscription has been deciphered, in honour of Caracalla, dated A.D. 213. There are traces of another long inscription on the *porta praetoria*, the most imposing of the four gates, but it is too broken and fragmentary to be deciphered. Numerous silver coins of Caracalla, Septimius Severus, and Severus Alexander have come to light, all in excellent preservation; also a silver armlet, a primitive leaden armlet, fragments of glass vessels, and of *terra sigillata*. In the neighbourhood of the Praetorium was found a broken head of a Genius with a mural crown.[1]

ITALY.

Palestro (Piedmont).—A pre-Roman tomb has been discovered, in which were two bronze fibulae of the form known as *a sanguisuga*. One is much larger and more perfect than the other; the foot ends in a series of knobs, and it is ornamented with spots of white enamel. From the pin hang a ring with eight knobs (probably an ornament for the hair), a curious rectangular frame with two little cups, perhaps for cosmetics, and ten other objects, including an ear-pick, two nail-files, and three pairs of tweezers. They are probably imitations of the real objects made for sepulchral purposes.[2]

Florence.—Important Roman remains have come to light near the Baptistery, belonging to a large private house of the time of the Republic, and shewing in the arrangement of the rooms some remarkable peculiarities of the Tuscan style. The *atrium* or *cavaedium*, the *tablinum*, and some of the *cubicula* still exist, and are quite distinct, but the vestibule and door have been destroyed to make way for later constructions. In the *atrium* a headless marble dog was found, which recalls the *cave canem* mosaics at Pompeii. The coins and inscriptions are all of the later Imperial times, shewing that the house was inhabited down to those times. One inscription is a public decree by the *decuriones* of Florentia, another, a dedication in honour of Sextus Gabinius and another *vir illustris*.[3]

Imola.—Remains of a Roman bridge have been found in the river Santerno. On a block which has formed the keystone is an inscription, much injured. A mosaic pavement has also been found here, with various patterns for the different parts of the house. The best specimen is in the *tablinum*, the patterns consisting of bands of foliage with Bacchic masks and a tree-trunk with garlands of leaves and fruit, pomegranates and pines, all in polychrome.[4]

Baiae.—A *cippus* has been found with important inscriptions, relating to one L. Caecilius Dioscurus, *curator augustalium Cumanorum dupliciarius et perpetuus embaenitariorum tricrum piscinensium*. The last three words must relate to makers of fishing-boats which were used on the *piscinae* attached to large villas, such as were possessed by Nero (at Baiae) and Severus Alexander. The inscription dates from the reign of the latter Emperor. The word *embaeniticam* occurs in Cic. *ad Fam.* viii. 1, 21, for a boat.[2]

Pompeii.—The houses in Insula xv. to the north of the house of Vettius have been completely investigated. They contained among other things a marble statue of a Nymph and two interesting terra-cotta figures. One of these represents a drunken old woman seated with a bowl in her left hand and a jar at her feet. It has served as a vase. The motive appears to be derived from a statue by Myron at Smyrna, mentioned by Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* xxxvi. 32). The other has also served as a vase, and represents an elephant with a tower on its back, driven by a negro. The tower is fastened on by three chains, and over the body is drapery falling to the feet; on three sides of the castle are hung shields, and above are small openings. Among the paintings on the walls are Artemis and a youth, accompanied by two Cupids, a subject otherwise unknown; Perseus and Andromeda seated on a rock, the former holding up the Gorgon's head, the reflection of which is seen below; Helen and Paris at Sparta; Bacchus; and Venus Anadyomene.[2]

Atena (Lucania). A *cippus* has been discovered bearing an important inscription: C·SEMPRONIVS· TI·F | AP·CLAVDIVS·C·F | P·LICINIVS·P·F | III VIR·A·I·A. The three last letters stand for *agris iudicandis assignandis*, a title given by the Lex

[1] *Athenaeum*, 4 Sept.

[2] *Notizie dei Lincei*, Jan. 1897.

[3] *Athenaeum*, 14 Aug.

[4] *Notizie dei Lincei*, Feb. 1897.

Sempronia in B.C. 135. The inscription is a reminiscence of the work done by the Gracchi for the proletariat in distributing the *ager publicus* among the poor. P. Licinius was substituted for Tiberius Gracchus as triumvir when the latter was murdered. On the side of the *cippus* is inscribed K (=*Kardo*) VII, a surveyor's sign. Five similar boundary *cippi* have been found, one at Capua, now in the Naples Museum (*C.I.L.* i. 552 and x. 3861).[5]

SICILY.

Catania. A small necropolis of the latest Roman times has been excavated, with several rows of tombs arranged like those in the Christian catacombs. The objects found resemble those from the necropolis of Grotticelli at Syracuse. Two inscriptions were found, one in Greek, of a Christian character, the other in Latin relating to a soldier from Gallia Narbonensis belonging to the Legio Septima Gemina. This legion was created by Galba, and was recruited chiefly from Spain and that part of Gaul, but this is the first mention of it in Sicilian inscriptions.[6]

Modica. Dr. Orsi has made a discovery of some prehistoric stone-pits used as burial-places. They contained some very primitive stone knives, and earthen vessels characteristic of the first Sicilian period; also a vase of Dipylon style and fragments of a hydria with geometrical decoration.[3]

GREECE.

Paros. A new fragment of the Parian marble calendar has been found at Parikia, and finally decides the question of the real provenance of the other part. It contains thirty-three lines, describing events from 336 to 299 B.C., including the victories of Alexander and events under the earlier Diadochi. Unfortunately part of the stone relating to the more uncertain events is obliterated, but many new facts about Ptolemy, Nikokreon of Cyprus, and Agathokles of Syracuse have been recovered, also a list of the victories of the comic poets Philemon and Menander, the death of a hitherto unknown poet Sosiphanes, and the eruption of Etna in 480 B.C. and other natural phenomena.[7]

ASIA MINOR.

Ephesus. During 1896 Prof. Benndorf excavated the Hellenistic city between the theatre and the Roman harbour. Many important remains of buildings came to light, including a gymnasium and an adjoining colonnade, and a magnificent building with columns of unusual size, having an elaborate wooden roof and a floor paved with geometrical patterns in thirteen different kinds of marble. Among the remains of sculpture were two statues over life-size, one in bronze of a nude youth, perhaps an original Attic work of the fifth century, the profile of the head recalling the Hermes of Praxiteles; the other is of white marble, representing a boy sitting with a duck under his left hand and supplicating for help with the right (for the type see Clarac, *Musée de Sculpt.* pls. 877, 877A). Also a group in black basalt of a Sphinx with the body of a lioness, tearing with her claws a youth lying prone on a rock; a fine male portrait head; a head of a woman, idealised, of late archaic style; and numerous bronzes, now mostly in Vienna, including a double bust of Herakles and Omphale and part of an incense-burner six feet high, very richly ornamented. Three hundred inscriptions have been found, one relating to the building of the city wall, in which one of the towers is styled *πύργος τοῦ Ἀστυάγου πάγου*, and one of the hill-tops to the west, the Hermaion; this inscription also shews that at that time the sea came up to the foot of the hill.[8]

H. B. WALTERS.

[5] *Notizie dei Lincei*, March 1897.
[6] *Athenaeum*, 10 July.
[7] *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 24 July.
[8] *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 3 July.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Mnemosyne. N.S. Vol. xxiv. Part 4. 1896.

Κέρματα, S. A. Naber. Notes on Xenophon's Hellenica. *Soph. Oed. Tyrann.* 15, S. A. N. Reads *προσκείμεθα* for *προσήμεθα*, and in Aesch. Pers. 880 *προσκείμεναι* for *προσήμεναι*. *De Plutarchi Moralium codicibus praecipuecque de codice Parisino D. n.* 1956, G. N. Bernardakis. 'Unus codex D salvus et incolumis, quantum quidem fieri poterat, ex gurgite illo vasto, quo fratres et parentes demersi sunt, evasit.' *Ad Fragmenta comicorum Graecorum.* H. van Herwerden. Critical notes. *De carminum Homericorum recensione Pisistratea*, M. Valeton. A criticism of the views of L. Erhardt and P. Cauer who have lately endeavoured to restore the belief in the genuineness of this recension. *De Cassii Dionis Zonaraeque historiis Epistula critica ad Ursulum Philippum Boissevain*, K. Kuiper. Critical notes. *Ad Minucii Felicis Octavium conjectanea*, J. C. G. Boot. *Vergilii Moretum*, H. T. Karsten. In l. 99 reads *testam* for *vestem* and considers l. 60 spurious as well as 36 and 75. *Ad Cornelii Nepotis Cimonem*, J. C. G. Boot. In iv. 2 reads *saepe, quum aliquem offensum* forte in via *videret minus bene vestitum* senem, *amiculum dedit.*

Vol. xxv. Part 1. 1897.

Homerica (continued from vol. 20), J. van Leeuwen. On the raft of Ulysses. *Homerica*, H. van Herwerden. On N 541 and Ξ 418 (*ἐπὶ δ' ἀσπὶς ἐάφθη*), O 31, 535, 653, P 441, 742, Σ 393 *sqq.*, Φ 322, Ψ 540, 602, Ω 358, 449–456, 720, 664, 729. *Observatiunculae de jure Romano* (continued), J. C. Naber. (1) De bonorum possessione Carboniana, (2) Quomodo fiat conventio. *Pindarica*, H. van Herwerden. Various notes with special reference to Christ's new edition. *ὕπαρ*, S. A. N. Some passages noticed in which this word is concealed by corruption. Κοσκυλμάτια, S. A. Naber. Notes on Xenophon's Memorabilia. *De Homeri Odysseae codice Phillipico* 1585, *olim Meermanniano* 307 (0), P. C. Molhuysen. *Ad Senecae dialogum de tranquillitate animi*, J. van der Vliet. Critical notes. *ὡς...καί, ad Thucyd.* vi. 36, J. v. L. In § 1 for *καὶ ὑποχειρίους* reads *ὡς καὶ ὑπ. Ad Herodoti librum* I., H. van Herwerden. Various notes. *Ad Thucyd.* vi. 37, 1, J. v. L. Considers *κούφαις* spurious in this section. *Ad Caesarem*, A. Poutsma. On the following passages in De Bello Gallico, iv. 21, 1, 22, 3, 4, 23, 2, vi. 12, 6, vii. 54, 4. *Ad Thucyd.* vi. 37, 2, J. v. L. Suggests *εἰ πόλιν*

ἑτέραν τοσαύτην ὅσαι Συρακουσαί εἰσιν ὅμορον οἰκειωσάμενοι τὸν πόλεμον ποιοῦντο. *De templis Romanis* (continued from vol. 23), J. M. J. Valeton. Article on the Pomerium continued. Here he deals with the meaning of the word quoting the authorities, next with the definitions put forward by scholars, next with the buildings and extensions of the walls. [The greater part of this article is continued into the following number].

Part 2. *Homerica* (continued from the last no.), J. van Leeuwen. On the most ancient codd. of the Odyssey. *Observatiunculae de jure Romano* (continued) J. C. Naber. (1) Ad edictum divi Hadriani, (2) de centumvirali judicio. *ὡς—εἰ. Ad Thucyd.* ii. 38, 4, J. v. L. For ὡς δυνατὰ would read εἰ δυνατὰ. *Ad Aeschinem*, H. van Herwerden. Notes on the three extant orations. *Scholia Persii et Juvenalis*, J. van der Vliet. *Ad Aristophanem ejusque Scholiastas*, H. van. Herwerden. Notes on the text and Scholia of The Peace.

Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik. Vol. 155. Part 2. 1897.

Das schlachtfeld im Teutoburger walde, ii., A Wilms. Continued from the last no. [*Cl. Rev.* sup. p. 175]. O. Keller's *Zur lateinischen sprachgeschichte*, F. Cramer. Part i., Latin etymologies, Part ii., Grammatical essays. *Zum rückmarsch des Xerxes*, F. Vogel. Supports the article of Welzhofer [see sup. p. 84] which attempts to find the true proportions of Xerxes' march back, by a ref. to Xen. Anab. i. 2, 9. *Zu Ammianus Marcellinus*, K. Niemeyer. Various critical notes. *Zu Vitruvius* de architectura, O. Keller. In i. 11, defends *plerumque* where Frisemann has conjectured *plerarumque. Über die abhandlung* de poematibus *des Diomedes*, A. Buchholz. In opposition to the general opinion that this treatise is to be attributed to Suetonius, with the exception of a small portion, it is maintained that Diomedes used Probus directly for the whole treatise except the conclusion, for which he names another source, viz. Suetonius. *Zu J. A. Cramers anecdota Parisiensia*, O. Höfer. In vol. 4 p. 341 for Φορμίων κρηπὶς λόγων reads Φ. κοπὶς λόγων from Plut. Phok. 5.

Revue de Philologie. Vol. xxi. 2. April, 1897.

De l'expression de l'aoriste en latin, A. Meillet. *Sur un passage de l'Electre de Sophocle*, P. Masqueray. Maintains that the line after 1428 to correspond to 1409 is not wanting in the MSS., but is supplied by the cries of Clytaemnestra behind the scenes. *Hérodote* i. 126, E. Tournier. In the sentence αὐτός τε γὰρ δοκέω θείῃ τύχῃ γεγονὼς τάδε ἐς χεῖρας ἄγεσθαι the predicate is in the participle and the meaning is 'nam et ego, qui hoc opus aggredior, divina sorte natus mihi videor.' *Dion Chrysostome*, Rhodiaca (xxxi.), *observations critiques*. H. Weil. *Notes sur Thucydide*, E. Chambry. On various passages, critical and explanatory. *Clepsydre ou Hydraule*, C. E. Ruelle. Simplicius in Aristotelis physica p. 160, v. has ἐν ταῖς ὑδραύλεσιν where we expect ἐν ταῖς κλεψύδραις which Themistius has. The text of Simplicius is probably corrupt and should be corrected. *Vitruve*, xii., Preface 16, B. Haussoullier. The words *ipsius Dianae servus* refer to the ἱεροὶ παῖδες of inscrr. who were slaves belonging to the goddess. *Horace*, Sat. i. 6. 14, A. Cartault. Reads *negante* for *notante*. *Frontin et Vitruve*, P. Tannery. The testimony of Frontinus, without being decisive, weakens the authority of Vitruvius, and can be used in favour of rejecting parts. *Ovide*, G. Lafaye. In Met. ii. 278 suggests *fractaque* for *sacraque*. *Tacite*, L. Duvau. In Dial. Orat. 16 the unintelligible *sicut his clamet* represents *sicut in scaena*, a marginal note which has crept into the text.

Part 3. July, 1897.

Le 'Codex Turnebi' de Plaute, W. M. Lindsay. A further account of this [see *sup.* p. 177]. *Plaute*, P. Berret. In Rud. 1139 proposes *situlicula* for *sicilicula* [see *Cl. Rev.* i. 306]. *Le roi des Saturnales*, L. Parmentier and F. Cumont. On the alleged sacrifice of the 'King' at the end of the Saturnalia in Moesia, as described in the Acts of St. Dasius. *Sur un passage du Catalogue des tragédies d'Eschyle*, M. Niedermann. For Σεμέλη ἡ ὑδροφόρος proposes Σ. ἡ ἠτροφόρος, see Schol. Apoll. Rhod. i. 636. *Notes critiques sur l'Anabase de Xénophon*, P. Couvreur. *Un nouveau fragment tragique*, L. Havet. In Cicero Harusp. rep. 39, the words *deorum . . . figuntur* are probably from the *Athamas* of Attius. *Le gentilice de Tigellin*, P. Fabia. We must restore *Ofonium* in Tac. Ann. xiv. 51 etc. as against *Sophonium*, the conjecture of J. Lipsius. *Quae sit causa cur in indicanda Andocidis patria inter duos pagos fluctuet Pseudo-Plutarchus*, M. Niedermann. *Phaedr*, L. Havet. In i. 6. 2 proposes *nos laquearc* for *mala videre*. *Sénèque*, G. Lafaye. On the title *dialogi* applied to the philosophical treatises, also critical notes on *ad Helviam matrem de consolatione. Lettre à M. Éd. Tournier*, V. J. Keelhoff. In Herod. i. 86 [see *sup.* p. 174] defends the negative, but doubts the genitive after δύεσθαι in prose. *Notes sur deux inscriptions de la confédération des Magnètes*, M. Holleaux. *Notes sur les fragments des Cyranides retrouvés dans un manuscrit de la Bibliothèque nationale*, C. E. Ruelle. *Orphica*, P. Tannery. On frag. i. Abel etc.

Hermathena. No. 23. 1897.

On Vellcius Paterculus, Robinson Ellis. Restores to Warburton some corrections published by him in 1736, also gives critical notes. *The Apocalypse of St. John, in a Syriac version, hitherto unknown*, T. K. Abbott. This has been edited from a MS. in the Earl of Crawford's Library by Prof. Gwynn, and is of much interest. *Novatiani* de Trinitate liber, *its probable history*, J. Quarry. Maintains that it is quite unlike Novatian and is a translation from some Greek work, suggests that it is a version of the lost work of Hippolytus against Artemon. *Iveron and Our Lady of the Gate*, J. B. Bury. The Greek text of the events connected with the foundation of the convent of Ivêrôn, and the legend of the image that swam over the sea, from a MS. in Lincoln Coll. Library. *Aristophanes*, R. Y. Tyrrell. In Pax 741–747 objects to the usual transposition of 742, 743 and suggests φεύζοντας for φεύγοντας. *Specimens of a translation of the Fourth Book of the Aeneid*, J. C. Martin. *Notes on some passages in Cicero's Letters*, J. S. Reid. In Fam. ix. 4 for *Coctio* read *Gargettio*, alluding to Epicurus: in Quint. fr. ii. 8 (10). for *non ab Hymetto sed ab †araysira* proposes *non a Gargetto sed ab Abdera*, alluding to Epicurus and Democritus: Att. iv. 17. 3 considers †*cociace* to be a depravation of *totus jacet*: Fam. xv. 18. 1 †*molestast* defends Baiter's *in olco est* as alluding to the midnight lamp: Fam. v. 20. 2 *servo* should probably be *Laurea*, the name of the scribe.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN BOOKS.

Aeschylus. Septem contra Thebas, ed. by F. G. Plaistowe, with Introduction and Notes. Crown 8vo. 80 pp. Clive. (Univ. Tut. Series.) 3*s.* 6*d.*

—— Septem contra Thebas, translated by F. G. Plaistowe. Crown 8vo. 40 pp. Clive. (Univ. Tut. Series.) 2*s.* 6*d.*

Aristoteles. Nicomachean Ethics. Books 1, 2, 3, 4, 10. Translated by F. Harvey. Crown 8vo. Oxford, H. Harvey. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Cicero. Pro Plancio, ed. with Introduction and Notes by H. W. Auden. 12mo. 234 pp. Macmillan. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Demosthenes. The first Philippic and the Olynthiacs, with Introduction and Notes by J. E. Sandys. 12mo. 320 pp. Macmillan. (Classical Series.) 5*s.*

Euripides. Troades, with Notes by R. Y. Tyrrell. 12mo. 150 pp. Macmillan. (Classical Series.) 2*s.* 6*d.*

Homer. Odyssey, Books 13–24, with Introduction and Notes by W. W. Merry. Crown 8vo. 394 pp. Frowde. 5*s.*

—— Snider (D. J.) Homer's Iliad with preliminary survey of the four Literary Bibles: a Commentary. 12mo. St. Louis. $2.25.

Horace. Odes in English in the Original Metres, by P. E. Phelps. Crown 8vo. 34 pp. Parker. 4*s.* 6*d.*

Johnston (H. W.) Latin Manuscripts, an Elementary Introduction to the use of Critical Editions for High School and College Classes. 8vo. ii, 13 pp. Plates. Chicago. $2.25.

ΛΟΓΙΑ 'ΙΗΣΟΥ. Sayings of our Lord from an early Greek Papyrus, discovered and edited with Translation and Commentary by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt. 8vo. 20 pp., 2 plates. Boards. Egyptian Exploration Fund. 2*s.*

Mahaffy (J. P.) A survey of Greek Civilisation. Crown 8vo. 344 pp. Macmillan. 6*s.*

Merill (E. T.) Fragments of Roman Satire from Ennius to Apuleius. 16mo. 178 pp. American Book Co. 75 cts.

Morris (W. O'Connor.) Hannibal, soldier, statesman, patriot, and the crisis of the struggle between Carthage and Rome. 12mo. xvi, 376 pp. Putnams. (Heroes of Nations Series.) $1.50.

Pellison (M.) Roman Life in Pliny's time, from the French by Maud Wilkinson, with Introduction by F. J. Miller. 12mo. 315 pp., engravings. Meadville. $1.

Platon. Phaedo, translated with test papers by A. E. Blagrave and C. S. Fearenside. Crown 8vo. 78 pp. Clive. (Univ. Tut. Series.) 2*s.* 6*d.*

Sophocles. Tragoediae, edited by R. Y. Tyrrell. Crown 8vo. Macmillan. (Parnassus Library.) 5*s.*

Tacitus. Histories, Book 3. Translation with test papers by J. D. Maillard. Crown 8vo. 68 pp. Clive. (Univ. Tut. Series.) 2*s.* 6*d.*

—— Dialogus de Oratoribus, with Prolegomena, Critical and Exegetical Commentary, Indexes, and a Bibliography by A. Gudeman. 8vo. xxxviii, 447 pp. Ginn. $2.75.

Valerius Maximus. Selections from Anecdotes, with Vocabulary, Notes, and Exercises, by C. H. Ward. 18mo. 164 pp. Macmillan. (Elem. Classics.) 1*s.* 6*d.*

Xenophon. The fifth book of Xenophon's Anabasis, ed. by A. G. Rolfe. 16mo. v, 115 pp. Ginn. 45 cts.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

Allard (P.) Le christianisme et l'Empire romain de Néron à Théodose. 8vo. xii, 303 pp. Paris, Lecoffre. 3 frs. 50.

Anthologia lyrica sive lyricorum graecorum veterum praeter Pindarum reliquiae potiores, post Th. Bergkium IV edidit Ed. Hiller. Emend. et auxit O. Crusius. 12 mo. lxxvii, 387 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk.

Aristeae quae fertur ad Philocratem epistulae initium (§§ 1–42 M. = pp. 13–23 Schm.) apparatu critico et commentario instructum ed. L. Mendelssohn. (Aus Acta et commentationes universitatis Jurevi-ensis. 8vo. iv, 52 pp. Jurievi. 1 Mk. 20.

Aristophanis Equites, rec. A. von Velsen. Ed. II., cur. K. Zacher. 8vo. xxii, 109 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk.

—— Plutus, expliqué littéralement, traduit en français et annoté par M. Cattant. 12 mo. 191 pp. Paris, Hachette. 2 frs. 25.

Aristoteles. Commentarii in Aristotelem graeca, edita consilio et auctoritate Academiae scientiarum Borussicae. Vol. XIV, pars II. (Joannis Philoponi in Aristotelis libros de generatione et corruptione commentaria, ed. H. Vitelli.) 8vo. x, 356 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 14 Mk.

—— Vahlen (J.) Hermeneutische Bemerkunger zu Aristoteles' Poetik. (Aus Sitzungsber. der Akad. der Wiss. zu Berlin.) 8vo. 18 pp. Berlin. 1 Mk.

Avienus. Le favole di Aviano, trascritte secondo il codice della biblioteca municipale di Reggio-Emilia da Ad. Levi. 8vo. 29 pp. Reggio-Emilia.

Batiffol (P.) Anciennes litératures chrétiennes. La litérature grecque. 8vo. xvi, 347 pp. Paris, Lecoffre.

Beiträge (Philologisch-historische), Curt Wachsmuth zum 60. Geburtstag überreicht. 8vo. vii, 218 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 8 Mk.

Blümner (Hugo) Satura. Ausgewählte Satiren des Horaz, Persius und Juvenal in freier metrischer Übertragung. 8vo. xix, 268 pp., 19 engravings. Leipzig, Teubner. 5 Mk.

Brock (A.) Quaestionum grammaticarum capita duo. 8vo. 184 pp. Jurievi (Dorpati). 3 Mk.

Callimachi hymni et epigrammata, iterum ed. U. de Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. 8vo. 66 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 80 Pf.

Cicero. Schiche (Theo.) Zu Cicero's Briefwechsel während seiner Statthalterschaft von Cilicien. 4to. 27 pp. Berlin, Gärtner. 1 Mk.

Corpus inscriptionum graecarum Graeciae septentrionalis. Vol. III, Fasc. I.: Inscriptiones graecae Phocidis, Locridis, Aetoliae, Acarnaliae, insularum maris Ionii, ed. Guil. Dittenberger. Folio. vii, 212 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 22 Mk. 50.

Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae. Vol. L. (last.) Joannis Zonarae epitomae historiarum libri XVIII. ex rec. M. Pinderi. Tomus III (libri XIII.–XVIII.) Ed. Th. Büttner-Wobst. 8vo. xxi, 933 pp. Bonn, Weber. 24 Mk.

Curtius (Ernst.) Köhler (Ul.) Gedächtnissrede auf Ernst Curtius. (Aus Abhandlungen der Akad. der Wissensch. zu Berlin.) 4to. 14 pp. Berlin. 80 Pf.

Dartigue-Perou (J.) Marc Aurèle dans ses rapports avec le christianisme. 8vo. 239 pp. Paris, Fischbacher.

Denkmäler griechischer und römischer Skulptur in historischer Anordnung. Unter Mitwirkung von Heinr. Brunn herausgegeben von Fr. Bruckmann. Fortgesetzt von P. Arndt. Parts 92–93. Royal folio. 5 plates each part, Index 73 pp, Munich, Verlagsanstalt. 20 Mk. each part; Index 2 Mk.

Dieterich (Alb.) Pulcinella. Pompeianische Wandbilder und römische Satyr spiele. 8vo. x, 307 pp., 3 plates and engravings. Leipzig, Teubner, 10 Mk.

Dittmar (A.) Studien zur lateinischen Moduslehre. 8vo. xi, 346 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 8 Mk.

Dyroff (Ad.) Die Ethik der alten Stoa untersucht. (Berliner Studien der class. Philologie von O. Seyffert. New Series. Vol. II, parts 2–4.) 8vo. xvi, 410 pp. Berlin, Calvary. 12 Mk. 50.

Eudociae Augustae, Procli Lycii, Claudiani carminum graecorum reliquiae. Acced. Blempomachiae fragmenta, rec. A. Ludwich. 8vo. vi, 241 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 4 Mk.

Eusebius. Eusèbe de Césarée, Histoire ecclésiastique, éditée (en Syriaque) par P. Bedjan. 8vo. viii, 598 pp. Paris. 20 Frs.

Fränkel (M.) Epigraphisches aus Aegina. (Aus Abhandl. der Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin.) 4to. 38 pp. Berlin. 2 Mk.

Gerhard (Ed.) Etruskische Spiegel. Vol. V., by A. Klügmann and G. Koerte. Part XV., XVI. (last.) 4to. 20 plates and letterpress, iv pp. and pages 181–237 with engravings. Berlin, Reimer. Each part 9 Mk.

Greeven (G.) Die Siglen D M auf altchristlichen Grabschriften und ihre Bedeutung. 8vo. 158 pp. Erlangen.

Gruppe (O.) Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte. Vol. I. (Handbuch der Klassischen Alterthumswissenschaft von Iwan von Müller V, II, 1.) 8vo. 384 pp Munich, Beck. 7 Mk.

Hartwig (P.) Bendis. Eine archaeologische Untersuchung 4to. 4 ll., 27 pp., 8 engravings, 2 plates. Leipzig, Giesecke and D. 6 Mk.

Haym (C.) De puerorum in re scaenica Graecorum partibus. Part I. 8vo. 34 pp. Halle.

Historia Augusta. Lessing (C.) Historiae Augustae lexicon. Fasc. I. 4to. 24 pp. Berlin, Gärtner. 1 Mk.

Homeri Iliadis epitome Fr. Hocheggeri. In usum scholarum ed. A. Scheindler. 2 partes. 12mo. xxxiv, 160; xxi, 259 pp. Vienna, Gerold. 2 Mk. 60.

—— L'Odyssée d'Homère Mélésigène. Traduite vers pour vers par le comte Ulysse de Séguier. 12mo. vi, 485 pp. Paris, Didot. 10 frs.

—— Gedichte. Part III. Hilfsbuch, von O. Henke. Vol. II. Die Entstehung der homerischen Gedichte. Aus dem Gedankenschatz der Ilias. Altertümer. Der Kriegsschauplatz. Waffenwesen. Befestigungswesen. Kultus. Zur Psychologie und Ethic. 8vo. x, 198, plates and engravings. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk.

—— Gloeckner (Ferd.) Homerische Partikeln mit neuen Bedeutungen. Beiträge zur Lexicographie und zur Interpretation der homerischen Gedichte. Part I.: κε. 8vo. iii, 58 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 60.

—— Ludwich (A.) Ueber Homercitate aus der Zeit von Aristarch bis Didymos. 4to. 41 pp. Königsberg. 30 Pf.

Horace. Staedler (K.) Horaz' Oden an seine Freunde in Reimstrophen verdeutscht. 4to. 31 pp. Berlin, Gärtner. 1 Mk.

—— *Pühringer* (A.) Horatiana sive de ratione, quae intercedit inter Horatium et poetas Lyricos Graecos. 8vo. 32 pp. Melk.

Jahrbücher für classische Philologie, herausgegeben von Alfr. Fleckeisen. Suppl. Vol. XXIII, part 3. 8vo. iii and pp. 537–798. Leipzig, Teubner. 6 Mk. 40.

Jung (Jul.) Grundriss der Geographie von Italien und der Orbis Romanus. 2nd. ed. 8vo. viii, 178 pp. (Handbuch der klassischen Alterthumswissenschaft von Iwan von Müller III, 3, I.) Munich, Beck. 3 Mk. 50.

Knoke (F.) Die Kriegszüge des Germanicus in Deutschland. Supplement II. 8vo. 95 pp. 1 plate. Berlin, Gärtner. 2 Mk.

Köhm (J.) Quaestiones Plautinae Terentianaeque. 8vo. 56 pp. Giessen.

Leo (Fr.) Die plautinischen Cantica und die hellenistische Lyrik. (Aus Abhandl. der Gesellsch. der Wiss. zu Göttingen.) 4to. 115 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 7 Mk. 50.

Lindskog (Cl.) Studien zum antiken Drama. 2 parts. 8vo. 175, 84, 26 pp. Lund. 5 Mk.

Lucianus. Chabert (S.) L'Atticisme de Lucien. 8vo. 249 pp. Paris, Oudin.

Marcellus. Chabert (S.) De latinitate Marcelli in libro de medicamentis. 8vo. 140 pp. Paris, Oudin.

Müller (F.) Beiträge zur etymologischen Erklärung der griechischen Sprache. (Aus Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissensch. zu Wien. 8vo. 40 pp. Wien, Gerold. 1 Mk.

Neue (Fr.) Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache. Vol III. Das Verbum. 3rd. ed., by C. Wagener. Parts 10, 11. (last.) 8vo. ii pp. and pages 577–664. Berlin, Calvary. 3 Mk. 20.

Ovidii Carmina selecta, ed. C. J. Grysar, recogn. C. Ziwsa. Ed. iv. 12mo. xxii, 296 pp. Vienna, Gerold. 1 Mk. 50.

Paulcke (M.) De tabula iliaca quaestiones Stesichoreae. 8vo. 100 pp. 1 plate. Königsberg. 2 Mk.

Peter (H.) Die griechische Literatur über die römische Kaiserzeit bis Theodosius I. und ihre Quellen. 2 vols. 8vo. xi, 478; vi, 410 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 12 Mk.

Phaedrus. Vandaele (Hil.) Qua mente Phaedor fabellas scripserit. 8vo. iv, 105 pp. Paris, Bouillon. 3 Mk. 20.

Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt, recognoverunt L. Cohn et P. Wendland. Ed. minor. Vol. II. 8vo. xiii, 306 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 2 Mk.

Philippson (A.) Thessalien und Epirus. Reisen und Forschungen im nördlichen Griechenland. 8vo. xi, 422 pp., 8 plates. Berlin, Kuhl. 12 Mk.

Pichon (R.) Histoire de la littérature latine. 12mo. xviii, 987 pp. Paris, Hachette. 5 frs.

Pindari carmina cum deperditorum fragmentis selectis, iterum recogn. W. Christ. 12mo. iv, 351 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 80.

Platon's ausgewählte Dialoge, erklärt von H. Sauppe. Vol. III. Gorgias. Herausgegeben von A. Gercke. 8vo. I.–VI. 186 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 2 Mk. 70.

Hirmer (Jos.) Entstehung und Composition der Platonischen Politeia. Aus Jahrbücher für class. Philologie, Suppl. Vol. XXIII. 8vo. 100 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk. 20.

Potter (E.) Vases antiques du Louvre, avec photogravures et dessins de J. Devillard. Salles A—E: les origines, les styles; écoles rhodienne et corinthienne. 4to. Double columns, 67 pp., plates. Paris, Hachette. 30 frs.

Reber (Frz.) Die phrygischen Felsendenkmäler. Untersuchungen über Stil und Entstehungszeit. (Aus Abhandl. der bayer. Akad. d. Wiss.) 4to. 70 pp., 20 engravings, 12 plates. Munich, Franz. 8 Mk.

Reich (H.) Uebungsbuch der griechischen Syntax. Part I. Die Syntax der Casus. 8vo. xi, 168 pp. Bamberg, Buchner. 2 Mk.

Reissinger (K.) Ueber Bedeutung und Verwendung der Präpositionen ob und propter im älteren Latein. Eine lexikalisch-semasiologische Untersuchung. 8vo. 82 pp. Erlangen.

Sallust's Jugurthinischer Krieg. Text für den Schulgebrauch von Th. Opitz. 12mo. vi, 101 pp., map. Leipzig, Teubner. 80 Pf.

Schmid (Wilh.) Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus. General Index. 8vo. iii., 234 pp. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer. 6 Mk.

Schreiber (Theo.) Die Wandbilder des Polygnotos in der Halle der Knidier zu Delphi. Vol. I. (Aus Abhandlungen der Sächs. Gesellschaft des Wissensch. zu Leipzig.) 8vo. v, 179 pp., 18 engravings. Leipzig, Hirzel. 8 Mk.

Simon (J. A.) Exoterische Studien zur antiken Poesie, namentlich zu Horaz, Tibull und Ovid. Vol. I. Zur Anordnung der Oden, Epoden und Satiren des Horaz. 8vo. iv, 80 pp. Köln. 2 Mk.

Sophocles. Tragédies, traduites par M. Bellaguet. 12mo. xx, 356 pp. Paris, Hachette. 3 frs. 50.

—— Kaibel (Geo.) De Sophoclis Antigona. 8vo 27 pp. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck. 50 Pf.

Studien (Leipziger) zur classischen Philologie. Herausgegeben von O. Ribbeck, H. Lipsius, C. Wachsmuth. Vol. XVIII. Part I. 8vo. 208 pp. Leipzig, Hirzel. 8 Mk.

Taciti de vita et moribus Julii Agricolae liber. Texte soigneusement revu, avec introduction et notes par L. Constans et P. Girbal. 8vo. 80 pp., map. Paris, Delagrave.

—— de situ ac populis Germaniae liber. Texte soigneusement revu, avec introduction et notes par L. Constans et P. Girbal. 8vo. 100 pp., map. Paris, Delagrave.

—— Dialogue des orateurs, traduit par Burnouf. Texte expliqué et revu par P. Le Nestour. 12mo. 303 pp. Paris, Hachette. 2 frs.

—— Gerber (A.) et A. Greef. Lexicon Taciteum Fasc xiii, 8vo. Pp. 1377–1488. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk. 60.

—— Groag (E.) Zur Kritik von Tacitus' Quellen in den Historien. (Aus Jahrbücher für class. Philologie, Suppl. Vol. XXIII.) 8vo . 42 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk. 80.

—— Kubik (J.) Realerklärung und Anschauungsunterricht bei der Lectüre des Tacitus. 8vo. 86 pp. Vienna, Hölder. 2 Mk.

Toepffer (Jo.) Beiträge zur griechischen Alterthumswissenschaft. 8vo. xvi, 384 pp., engraving. Berlin, Weidmann. 10 Mk.

Vergilii Maronis Aeneidos epitome. Acced. ex Georgicis et Bucolicis delectus, ed. E. Hoffmann. 4th ed. 12 mo. 266 pp. Vienna, Gerold. 1 Mk. 40.

—— Jahn (P.) Ueber die Abhängigkeit Vergils von Theocrit. 4to. 29 pp. Berlin, Gaertner. 1 Mk.

Weise (P.) Ueber den Weinbau der Römer. Part I. 4to. 21 pp. Hamburg. 2 Mk. 50.

Witkowski (Stan.) Prodromus grammaticae papyrorum graecarum aetatis Lagidarum. 8vo. 65 pp. Krakau. 3 Mk.

Xenophon. Gemoll (W.) Bemerkungen zu Xenophon's Anabasis. 8vo. 42 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 20.

(Aus 'Jahrbücher für class. Philologie,' Suppl. Vol. XXIII.)

Ziebarth (E.) Neue attische Hypothekeninschriften. 8vo. 12 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 50 Pf.

(Aus 'Sitzungsber. der Akad der Wissensch. zu Berlin.')

The Classical Review

NOVEMBER 1897.

SOME REMARKS ON THE ACCUSATIVE WITH INFINITIVE.

In teaching the theory of accusative with infinitive I have found it convenient to adopt the outlines of a method which I do not find explained in any grammar, and as the method seems to possess in some points also a theoretical superiority, it may be of interest to scholars. It consists in considering together the following constructions :—

(1) the final and predicative dative ;

(2) the nominative with infinitive, *e.g.* the 'historical' infinitive ;

(3) the independent accusative with infinitive in Greek and Latin ;

(4) the dependent accusative with infinitive.

Of these the first familiarizes us with the employment of the dative as a predicate, the second with the same employment of that dative which has become an infinitive : the third exhibits this dative predicate with an accusative for its subject, and in the fourth we have a hypotactic treatment of the third. Each of these stages will repay a little consideration.

(1) The predicative dative of the Latin is merely a species of the final dative found in most Indo-European languages, cf. Delbrück '*Vergleichende Syntax*' pp. 301–3. Roby's differentiation of the two (*Lat. Gr.* II. pp. xxv. *sqq.*) applies only to the Latin idiom, and even there requires to be considered along with doubtful cases, which may belong to either subdivision. If we take the phrase 'the infinitive has an accusative for its subject,' the expression 'for its subject' is in origin final, but in sense predicative and equivalent to 'as its subject.' In fact, the idea of *purpose* constantly passes—to use Monro's phrase (*Hom. Gr.*[2] § 231 p. 197)—into that of *adaptation*. In Sanskrit we have the dative both as a main predicate with, or more commonly without, the verb *to be* and as a secondary predicate with various verbs, cf. Delbrück *loc. cit.* and Speyer *Vedische u. Sanskrit-Syntax* § 48. The sense may or may not be final : thus *sómo mádāya* may mean 'soma is for intoxication' or 'soma is intoxicating' (*adaptation*). The same dative is found even attributively used.

(2) The nominative with the infinitive is found at least in Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin. 'The Vedic infinitives in *-e* and *-tave* (*-tavai*) can be used with passive sense to form the predicate of negative sentences and have then the force of a Latin gerundive' (or adj. in *-bilis*). 'So *Rg-Veda* 8, 78, 5 *nákīm Índro nîkartave* 'Indra is not to be overcome' (Speyer *op. cit.* § 216 *c.*), and in the classical language we have similar cases with the inf. in *-tum*, as *ārtatrāṇāya vaḥ çastram na prahartum anāgasi* 'your weapon is for the protection of the afflicted, not to strike the guiltless' (*ibid.* § 218). The restriction to negative sentences is for the earlier language little more than an accident, since the datival infinitives are in many cases scarcely to be distinguished from ordinary datives, whose final use is not thus restricted. It is also natural, because in positive sentences the notions of necessity and possibility will generally be explicitly expressed. On this and the following infinitives we may now compare

Delbrück's *Syntax* II. in the *Grundriss d. Vergl. Gramm. d. Indog. Sprachen*, pp. 440–475. Delbrück quotes one instance, *Rg-Veda* 4, 2, 1, where no negative appears. Regarding the assumption of a *dative sense* in infinitives of which some have a *locative form, vide* the same work, p. 441, 'For the syntax this fact is of no importance, since in the case of the infinitive the locative was from primitive times taken in tow by the dative.' So again of the German and Litu-Slav, 'However we understand the forms, their use is to be derived from an original dative sense.'

Finally, we have in Sanskrit, as well as in Greek and in prehistoric Italian dialects,[1] an employment of the nominative with infinitive not thus restricted. This is its employment in wishes or commands. From the Sanskrit we may quote two cases with the nominative expressed, viz.

á vo ruvaṇyúm auçijó huvádhyai—çáṁsam
R.V. 1. 122. 5.

'The son of Uçij shall sing a loud song to you.'

asmākāsaç ca sūráyo víçvā áçās tarīṣáṇ
R.V. 5. 10. 6.

'And our heroes shall (must) conquer all quarters.'

(Delbrück *A. S.* pp. 412 and 416). There are other cases where the subject, generally the first person, is not expressed. In the instances quoted the syntax is to be explained as involving an ellipse of the verb 'to be.'

The correspondence of this idiom with the Greek infinitive in commands has already been pointed out by Monro (*H. Gr.*[2] § 241) and others. Compare such a case as *Il.* 6. 86–92.

εἰπὲ δ' ἔπειτα
μητέρι σῇ καὶ ἐμῇ· ἡ δὲ ξυνάγουσα γεραιὰς
. . . . . .
θεῖναι Ἀθηναίης ἐπὶ γούνασιν ἠϋκόμοιο κ.τ.λ.

'And she is to place it on the knees, &c.'

ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τὸν Ἀχαιοὶ
εὐρύν θ' ὑψηλόν τε τιθήμεναι κ.τ.λ. *Il.* 23, 246-7.

'Then that also the Greeks must make &c.'

It is unnecessary to quote cases with the second person. With the first (as *Od.* 7. 311) the notion is naturally more that of wish than of command. It is to be observed that when no subject is expressed, as Ξ 501

εἰπέμεναί μοι Τρῶες ἀγανοῦ Ἰλιονῆος
πατρὶ φίλῳ καὶ μητρὶ γοήμεναι,

the syntax is rather different. We have no longer a statement with subject, verb (ἔστι &c.), and predicate (*i.e.* the infinitive), but an exclamation parallel to general directions with the infinitive in German (cf. La Roche *Hom. Unters.* ii. p. 74, Monro *H. Gr.*[2] § 241).

Now in these cases, except where the second person is concerned, the accusative with infinitive is incomparably the more common, and this raises an important question. But we must first refer to the *nom. c. inf.* as exemplified in the 'historical infinitive.' This is used as a sort of imperfect in descriptions (1) of *rapid*, (2) of *wonted*, action (v. Riemann *Synt. Lat.* § 164, Gildersleeve *Lat. Gr.* § 647, Schmalz p. 403 *Anm.* 2); but it really lacks a strict temporal application and gives rather a sketch than a description of what is done (see Gildersleeve *l.c.*). We may say that it states what the subject *takes in hand* or *sets to work* to accomplish. Plainly then this infinitive also is of a final origin and to be compared with the predicate dative. *Praesidio erat navibus*, originally 'he was for a guard to the ships,' comes to mean 'he acted as a guard to the ships'; and similarly *hostes fugere* 'the enemy (were, are) for flying,' comes to mean 'the enemy proceed to fly.' Schmalz (*l.c.*) derives this idiom from the old *imperative* sense of the infinitive: but surely it is the predicative rather than the strictly final dative to which it is allied. Schmalz's explanation is now repeated by Delbrück *op. cit.* pp. 457–8, who refers to a paper by Wackernagel, which I have not seen. At present, I cannot regard this theory except as very unnatural. A passage like Plautus *Trin.* 288, *ap.* Delbrück, is widely different from ordinary narrative. There is a construction to which the historic inf. presents a noticeable resemblance, viz. the Gk. inf. in consequences, on which *vide infra.* For the historic inf. generally continues a narrative in the indicative.

(3) We come now to a most important question. For, as stated above, the *accusative* with infinitive is more common in *wishes* (the nominative occurs perhaps once only ω 380) even of the first person, while in commands we find it in Homer with the third person, and in later Greek it is the ordinary idiom for laws, decrees, commands, and occurs with the greatest frequency in both inscriptions and books. We may quote

(*a*) commands:

τοὺς Θρᾷκας ἀπιέναι, παρεῖναι δ' εἰς ἔνην. Ar. *Ach.* 172.

[1] If *legimini* = λεγέμεναι.

εἰ δέ κ' Ἀλέξανδρον κτείνῃ ξανθὸς Μενέλαος,
Τρῶας ἔπειθ' Ἑλένην καὶ κτήματα πάντ' ἀποδοῦναι. Γ 284–5;

(*b*) wishes:

Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἢ Αἴαντα λαχεῖν ἢ Τυδέος υἱόν. H. 179.
θεοὶ πολῖται, μή με δουλείας τυχεῖν. Aesch. *Sept.* 253.

(cf. La Roche *op. cit.* p. 77.)

There is no question here of oblique speech: the sentences are direct expressions of desire, wherein the nominative would be on all analogy to be expected. Why therefore have we the accusative? The theory of an ellipse will attract only those who have an inclination towards easy explanations which explain nothing. Delbrück, however, *op. cit.* p. 456. still thinks a word like δός might be dimly thought of (*vorschweben*). But if no word is definitely understood, then we have a new idiom: and if so, how old? I think it belongs to the *Ursprache*.

Now we find an unmistakably analogous idiom in the Latin accusative with infinitive in exclamations, *e.g.* Ter. *Adelph.* 237–8.

hocine incipere Aeschinum
Per oppressionem ut hanc mi eripere postulet!

Therefore, if we assume that the primitive tongue employed an accusative of the subject and predicate in simple acclamations, and that such acclamations were used or could be used in the special sense of commands, wishes, expressions of surprise or admiration, then the whole question will be near solution. Now the Sanskrit provides us with just such an idiom. In the *Çatapathra Brāhmaṇa* (Delb. *A. S.* § 125) and also in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* (Speyer, *Ved. u. Sk. Syntax* § 30) we have cases, which may hereafter be paralleled elsewhere, of an accusative of exclamation following the particle *ed*: such are

éyāya vāyúr éd dhatáṃ vṛtrám. *Ç. B.* 4. 1. 3. 4.
'Vāyu went and lo! Vṛtra slain!'
te 'bhitaḥ paricarantā ait paçum eva nirāntraṃ çayānaṃ. *Ait. Br.* 2. 13. 6.
'They going about, lo! the sacrificial animal lying entrailless!'

Attempts have been made to explain these as cases of accusative after the preposition *ā* + *id.* But this construction is unexampled except where the accusative precedes, and the suggestion is not even mentioned by Speyer in his new *Syntax*. On the other hand, we may point to analogies in other languages. In English 'him to do such a thing' is the natural and usual expression, of which the corrected form with 'he' is merely an artificial variant. From the Latin Delbrück aptly quotes the idiom after *en* and *ecce*, as in *em tibi hominem! ecce me, em metum, em memoriam, en quattuor aras* (Verg. *Ecl.* 5. 65), whence came the contractions *ellum eccum* &c. *edepol mortalem graphicum, si servat fidem* Plaut. *Pseud.* 519. Whether with the cry '*Tiberium in Tiberim* (Suet. *Tib.* 75) a definite verb was understood is quite disputable. To the same class also belong such cases as *me miserum, hominem impudicum, O puerum pulchrum,* ὠ ἐμὲ δείλαιον, and Ar. *Av.* 1269–70,

δεινόν γε τὸν κήρυκα, τὸν παρὰ τοὺς βροτοὺς
οἰχόμενον, εἰ μηδέποτε νοστήσει πάλιν,

where the nominative would express a judgment and not an exclamation.[1] These are cases of subject and predicate in the accusative, and, since we have shown that the infinitive may be a mere predicate, are strictly analogous to an accusative with infinitive. Simple accusatives after interjections, or without them, we of course have in Latin, in Greek—where note Ar. *Av.* 274

οὗτος ὦ σέ τοι

and Soph. *Ant.* 441

σὲ δὴ, σέ, τὴν νεύουσαν εἰς πέδον κάρα,
φῇς ἢ καταρνῇ μὴ δεδρακέναι τάδε—

and also in Sanskrit after *dhik* (e.g. *dhiṅ mām* 'shame on me,' *dhiṅ māṃ vinoda-mṛgam* 'shame on me a pet animal') and also after *hā*.[2]

There is therefore no reason for questioning the great antiquity of the construction. The fact being ascertained, we may well postpone the inquiry into its explanation.

[1] Mr. Marindin writes to me that he regards τὸν κήρυκα as an *acc. of reference*, the noun being taken out of its sentence: he compares *Av.* 651, ἐστὶν λεγόμενον δή τι τὴν ἀλωπεχ', ὡς . . . . ἐκοινώνησεν: he compares also οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, &c.: the sentence is then equivalent to δεινόν γ' ἐστὶν εἰ ὁ κῆρυξ κ.τ.λ. I do not find this inconsistent with the above, since this very *acc. of reference* would seem to be in its nature exclamatory.

[2] The acc. after νή and μά and in oaths without these particles is of a similar nature. So also the phrases, τὸ δε μέγιστον &c., γνώμην ἐμήν, τὸ σὸν μέρος.

The limits of the accusative need even after Delbrück's treatise still further discussion. But in English also we feel the appropriateness of the idiom, and we may say that in any exclamation the subject, where felt as an object, would naturally take the accusative: *ὦ τάλας ἐγώ*, with a nominative, is much nearer to a statement than *ὦ ἐμὲ δείλαιον*, with the case commonly used of objects.

The employment of the infinitive in such an idiom is even easier than that of an ordinary predicate. For since surprise consists in the difficulty of combining a subject and a predicate, this is more naturally expressed by a form, the infinitive, which does not *state*, but *suggests* the predication: 'Prodicus a philosopher!' is a more violent form of expression than 'Prodicus to be a philosopher.' Also the dative, as the case of something contemplated, renders the idiom of easy application to wishes and commands. I ascribe to the Ursprache the following types:—

(1) *Poeni fugati* (*sunt* &c.) 'the Carthaginians (were &c.) defeated.'

(2) *Poeni fugere* (*sunt* &c.) 'the Carthaginians proceed to fly.'

(3) *Poenos fugatos* 'the Carthaginians defeated!'

(4) *Poenos fugere* 'the Carthaginians in flight!'

of which the last two could perhaps even in the earliest times be employed in wishes and commands.

(4) The above considerations have an obvious bearing upon the question of the *dependent* accusative with infinitive. It follows at once that in that large class of cases where the construction is dependent upon intransitive verbs (*a*) of *surprise, indignation*, and other emotions, (*b*) of *will* and *desire*, the hypotactic construction may be simply and directly derived from an original parataxis. Thus in the sentences

(*a*) *νεμεσσήθη δ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ*
ξεῖνον δηθὰ θύρῃσιν ἐφεστάμεν. α 119–120.
(*b*) *ἄμφω γὰρ πέπρωται ὁμοίην γαῖαν ἐρεῦσαι.*
Σ 329,

if we omit the finite verbs, we have still left sentences which could stand as ordinary expressions of indignation and command. We may compare also expressions, common in vulgar English, such as 'It is a shame him to have treated us so,' which are patently derived from an earlier parataxis. That this is the correct explanation of the Greek idiom seems also to appear from the character of the Homeric instances, among which, if we may judge from the large number cited by La Roche (*Hom. Unters.* ii. pp. 17–19), there are practically no cases of the *acc. c. inf.* as subject where the derivation from parataxis would be out of place. We have no specimens of the type

ἀληθές ἐστιν ἐκεῖνον στρατηγεῖν,

the introductory words being in all cases expressions of *feeling, will*, or *necessity*. The substantive use of the infinitive, properly so-called, is also denied for Homer by Delbrück (*op. cit.* p. 471). The *subsequent* occurrence of this type we could readily explain. For in the expression

αἰσχρόν ἐστιν ἐκεῖνον στρατηγεῖν

since the emotion is already expressed in the introductory *αἰσχρόν ἐστιν*, the *acc. c. inf.* would inevitably be felt as a simple predication (cf. the English parallel suggested above), whence it would be an easy transition to

ἀληθές ἐστιν ἐκεῖνον στρατηγεῖν

We shall, however, mention (*infra*) the alternative explanation of this idiom.

In Latin also the *acc. c. inf.* is of great frequency after expressions of emotion (cf. Schmalz § 225), and here also it seems reasonable to derive the form

apparet illum fecisse

from the form

pudet illum fecisse.

The range covered by these explanations may be illustrated by the following examples:—

(*a*) Expressions of emotion in Greek:

(1) *μνηστῆρας οὔτι μεγαίρω ἔρδειν ἔργα βίαια.* β 235–6.

(2) *μίσησεν δ' ἄρα μιν δηΐων κυσὶ κύρμα γενέσθαι.* Ρ 272.

(3) *τῶ οὐ νεμεσίζομ' Ἀχαιοὺς ἀσχαλάαν.* Β 296–7.

(4) *σέβας δέ σε θυμὸν ἱκέσθω Πάτροκλον Τρῳῆσι κυσὶν μέλπηθρα γενέσθαι.* Σ 178–9.

(5) *μή τε θεῶν τό γε δείδιθι μήτε τιν' ἀνδρῶν ὄψεσθαι.* Ξ 342–3.

(6) *αἰσχρόν τοι δηρόν τε μένειν κενεόν τε νέεσθαι.* Β 298.

(7) *αἰδὼς δ' αὖ νεόν ἄνδρα γεραίτερον ἐξερέεσθαι.* γ 24.

(8) ἀνίη καὶ τὸ φυλάσσειν πάννυχον ἐγρήσσοντα. υ 52–3.
(9) πόνος ἐστὶν ἀνιηθέντα νέεσθαι. Β 291.

(*b*) Expressions of will, wish, &c., in Greek:

(1) κήρυκες ἐλίγαινον τοὺς ἴμεν. Λ 685–6,
(2) Δίοθεν μοι ἄγγελος ἦλθεν λύσασθαι φίλον υἱὸν ἰόντα. Ω 194–5.
(3) νεῦσε δέ οἱ λαὸν σῶν ἔμμεναι. Θ 246.
(4) ὤμοσα καρτερὸν ὅρκον μή τινα ἄλλον εἴσεσθαι Ζηνὸς βουλήν. Hymn Merc. 536–8.
(5) ἀρᾶται δὲ τάχιστα φανήμεναι ἠῶ δῖαν. I 240.
(6) φρονέω δὲ διακρινθήμεναι ἤδη Ἀργείους καὶ Τρῶας. Γ 98–9.
(7) ὄφρ' εἴπῃσι Ποσειδάωνι παυσάμενον πολέμοιο τὰ ἃ πρὸς δῶματ' ἰκέσθαι. Ο 56–8.
(8) Σαρπήδονα μοῖρ' ὑπὸ Πατρόκλοιο δαμῆναι. Π 433–4.
(9) οὔ σε ἔοικε κακὸν ὡς δειδίσσεσθαι. Β 190.
(10) τί δὲ δεῖ πολεμιζέμεναι Ἀργείους. I 337–8.

(*c*) Expressions of emotion in Latin:

It is unnecessary, and might be misleading, to quote instances under this head. For although the *acc. c. inf.* is common, and indeed regular, after these verbs, e.g. after *gaudeo, laetor, miror, maestus sum, pudet, poenitet*, &c. (cf. Schmalz [2] § 225), yet it is almost equally common after verbs and expressions denoting *will, wish*, and the like (*ib.* §§ 227–9); and yet there is no independent Latin use of the *acc. c. inf.* in these senses. In fact, the Latin syntax, here as elsewhere, represents a more developed stage than the Greek, and the dependent *acc. c. inf.*, though it may have had various starting points, has become substantially a single type. There are certainly cases which support the view that the language once employed the construction to convey a definite notion of *will:* such a case is the *acc. c. inf.* after *censeo*, which of itself does not necessarily imply *will*. But we do not find this idiom after *dico*, as in Greek after λέγω and εἶπον, &c., nor could we have it following verbs analogous to the above ἐλίγαινον, ἄγγελος ἦλθεν, and others of similar senses. Hence we here abstain from quoting examples, numerous though they are, of the construction governed by verbs of emotion.

Intimately connected with the preceding is a class of cases the bearing of which has not been sufficiently considered. I refer to the *acc. c. inf.* in consequences. The infinitive by itself is in this usage of considerable frequency in Homer, and is doubtless in point of antiquity equal to the infinitive of purpose. The *acc. c. inf.* after ὥστε is indeed a rarity in the epic, but we have such cases as

ἡμᾶς γ' οὔ πως ἔστι μεθιέμεναι πολέμοιο, N. 114,

and the construction after πρίν and πάρος in

ναῖε δὲ Πήδαιον πρὶν ἐλθεῖν υἷας Ἀχαιῶν, N. 172.
ἔνθα με κῦμ' ἀπόερσε πάρος πάδε ἔργα γενέσθαι, Z. 348

In the first class of cases we may without difficulty recognise the *accusative c. inf.* of exclamations, either (1) directly,

'Us to give up war! that cannot be,'

or (2) as a development from the type

αἰσχρόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς μεθιέμεναι πολέμοιο.

But the cases with πρίν and πάρος form a special group, requiring a special consideration. It has been shown (Sturm in Schanz's *Beiträge*, iii. pp. 13 sqq.) that the πρίν and πάρος originally go adverbially with the main verb, and the *acc. c. inf.* is used in the sense of 'with reference to the coming of the Greeks,' &c.[1] This apparently anomalous construction becomes clear when we observe that it is really parenthetical ('the Greeks to come'). We have, in fact, an instance of the idiom which the classical language exemplifies in the parenthetical phrases, ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, ὡς ἐπεικάζειν ἐμέ, ὅσον ἐμέ γε εἰδέναι, θέμις γ' εἶναι (where θέμις is really accusative), and so forth. That such phrases are absent from Homer may be due merely to stylistic reasons: in essence they appear in the πάρος construction. Their interjectional nature is unmistakable, while their relation to the consecutive *acc. c. inf.* appears partly by inspection, e.g. in the use of ὡς, and partly from the analogy of the Latin (*ut ita dicam, quod sciam*), English ('so to speak'), German ('so zu sagen'), and other languages. Therefore we may well derive these phrases, and with them the *acc. c. inf.* after πρίν, πάρος, ὡς, ὥστε, through such an interjectional and parenthetical employment from the *acc. c. inf.* of exclamation. Nor does the *acc. c. inf.* of command fail to appear: after ὥστε and ἐφ' ᾧτε introducing conditions, as in

[1] The ablatival infl. in Sanskrit after *purā, ā*, &c., essentially identical with this, prove the great antiquity of the construction.

ποιοῦνται ὁμολογίαν πρὸς Πάχητα, ὥστε Ἀθηναίοις ἐξεῖναι βουλεῦσαι περὶ τῶν Μυτιληναίων. Thuc. iii. 28,

the infinitive is as much an expression of will as if *ἐξεῖναι γάρ* had been written for *ὥστε ἐξείναι*.

From this instance we are led to consider yet a third case in which a reconsideration of grammatical theories seems required. Of the *acc. c. inf.* in consequences no previous explanation has been so much as suggested: in what follows we have to question the theory of 'ellipse.' Now if we take such a passage as Thuc. viii. 58,

...ξυνθῆκαι ἐγένοντο ἐν Μαιάνδρου πεδίῳ Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ τῶν ξυμμάχων πρὸς Τισσαφέρνην καὶ Ἱεραμένην καὶ τοὺς Φαρνάκου παῖδας περὶ τῶν βασιλέως πραγμάτων καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ τῶν ξυμμάχων. χώραν τὴν βασιλέως ὅση τῆς Ἀσίας ἐστὶ βασιλέως εἶναι,

no one will contend that we have in the second sentence an ellipse of a verb of decreeing. The *acc. c. inf.* is a direct form of command obliquely employed. But if we had

οὐκ ἤθελον οἱ βάρβαροι τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις περὶ τῶν πόλεων ἐνδοῦναι οὐδέν· χώραν γὰρ ὅση τῆς Ἀσίας εἴη βασιλέως εἶναι,

it would be claimed that we had an ellipse of a verb of saying. The question is of interest for two reasons, because it suggests a consideration of ellipse in general, and because of the analogies in other languages. Regarding the first point, we may say that there is a grammatical ellipse—which is not necessarily the same as a psychological ellipse—wherever the addition of a word or words is required by the grammatical construction. Here the theory is that the accusative (*χώραν*) is originally governed by a verb of saying; which would certainly be the case in such a sentence as

ἔφη ἐκεῖνον στρατηγεῖν.

In the present discussion the comparison of the two sentences certainly suggests a doubt whether the theory of ellipse will hold. But does the English, for instance, favour that theory? We might have the following:

'Cromwell was unwilling to show mercy to any of the defeated party. They were men of ungodly character, and had proved traitors to every engagement into which they had entered.'

Here the 'were' and 'had shown' are historically ambiguous, but in neither case is there any grammatical ellipse. *Either* they are optatives, as in the German idiom, in which case they are equivalent to 'would be' and 'would have shown' ('might be,' 'might have shown'), and the idiom is semi-dramatic. For whereas to quote the actual thought 'they are men' 'they have shown' would be entirely dramatic, and to say 'they would appear to him to be men—and to have shown' would be in no degree dramatic, the employment of 'they were' for 'they would appear to be' is midway between the two. This idiom corresponds to the Greek optative of oratio obliqua. *Again*, if 'they were' 'they had shown' are simple narrative tenses, we have again no grammatical, but only a psychological ellipse: that these are thoughts of Cromwell is *implied*. This second idiom exists in Greek and Latin (cf. Tac. *Hist.* iv. cc. 83–4). From this and not *vice-versa* is derived the Homeric construction after *ὅτι* and the English construction after 'that': 'he said they were mistaken' is prior to 'he said that they were mistaken.'

Of these idioms, therefore, neither supplies us with a parallel to the supposed ellipse of the Greek. They are both non-oblique forms, and their indirectness is not expressed, but merely sub-dramatically or dramatically implied. They offer no real analogy to the unannounced accusative with infinitive, which we at first sight regard as of a similar nature.

Such an analogy we could have only if the English could omit the verb of declaring in the sentence 'he declared them to be traitors,' and say 'Them to be traitors' as an unannounced indirect quotation. This we cannot do, and it is distinctly difficult to suppose that the Greeks and Latins could. It may indeed be said that the type

ἀληθές ἐστιν ἐκεῖνον στρατηγεῖν,

being derived from

ἔφη ἐκεῖνον στρατηγεῖν,

shows an intermediate stage. But we have already suggested a different derivation for the former, and if it is objected that the identical sense of the *acc. c. inf.* in the two cases forbids us to separate them, we must reply that in language an identical sense is frequently conveyed by distinct *grammatical types*, and if the analogy of sense (*κατὰ σύνεσιν*) has in various cases violated the grammatical distinction, this is an exceptional occurrence which has in each instance to be proved.

I therefore propose to regard this unannounced *acc. c. inf.* as in its nature dramatic —which we must feel this 'neat and delight-

ful' idiom to be—and in fact of an exclamatory origin. The Sanskrit *éd dhatám vṛtrám*, the Greek δεινόν γε τὸν κήρυκα, are exclamatory forms not necessarily implying indignation or even great surprise, but merely emphatic novelty, and are strictly analogous to our newspaper headings, 'Great battle in South America: the Chilians victorious!' and the like. To what case the English feeling would assign the nouns in these expressions is certainly doubtful; nor is it any more clear how the Latin or Greek would render them. But this much we may certainly say: since every exclamation is an abbreviated predication,[1] the cases found in it must be precisely those which the complete predication would have contained. Therefore the above are nominative or accusative expressions according as they are felt to mean 'the Chilians are stated to be victorious' or 'think of the Chilians as victorious.' This distinction appears in a familiar idiom of the ancient languages. In what is termed apposition to the sentence, e.g.:

(*a*) with nominative,

λόγοι δ' ἐν ἀλλήλοισιν ἐρρόθουν κακοὶ,
φύλαξ ἐλέγχων φύλακα.
Soph. *Ant.* 259–60.

ἱκέται δ' ὄντες Ἀγοραίου Διός
βιαζόμεσθα, καὶ στέφη μιαίνεται,
πόλει τ' ὄνειδος καὶ θεῶν ἀτιμία.
Eur. *Her.* 69–71.

(*b*) with accusative,

Ἑλένην κτάνωμεν, Μενελέῳ λύπην πικράν.
Eur. *Or.* 1105; cf. ll. 961–2,
Aesch. *Choeph.* l. 199.

manu intentantes, causam discordiae et initium armorum.
Tac. *Ann.* 1. 27.

pars ingenti subiere feretro, triste ministerium.
Verg. *Aen.* vi. 222–3.

the phrases in apposition are accusative or nominative in form according as they are regarded as objects or subjects, which is practically identical with the usual statement that they are accusative or nominative according as the *verb* is active or passive. That the accusative in these cases is exclamatory is not at all disproved by showing that they are sometimes (cf. Conington *ad Aen.* vii. 222–3) of a cognate nature. For any accusative, cognate or otherwise, may by occasional or regular disconnection with any *particular* verb be employed in exclamation. Between the looser kinds of cognate accusative and exclamations it is impossible to draw a definite line.

Returning now to the Greek sentence:—

οὐκ ἤθελον οἱ βάρβαροι τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις περὶ τῶν πόλεων ἐνδοῦναι οὐδέν· χώραν γὰρ ὅση τῆς Ἀσίας εἴη βασιλέως εἶναι.

I propose to regard the *acc. c. inf.* χώραν... εἶναι as an exclamation put *dramatically* into the mouth of the βάρβαροι:—

The Barbarians refused to make to the L. any concessions touching the cities. The country, as much as appertained to Asia, the king's!

The accusative is employed in these exclamations because the thing named is conceived of objectively. The result therefore of this reasoning is practically identical with the common theory....., viz. that the accusative is governed by an implied transitive. But theoretically and historically there is a considerable difference. For whereas Goodwin (§ 757) and others would supply a definite verb, ἔλεγον or an equivalent, we supply only the notion of objectivity. According to the common theory the *acc. c. inf.* is merely a clipped expression, having no quality but brevity and unsupported by definite analogies or historical evidence. To us it has, like so many other cases of oratio obliqua, a *dramatic* quality, and a close relation to independent idioms, the parenthetic accusative with infinitive, namely, and other exclamatory constructions, and thirdly the employment of the *acc. c. inf.* after ὥστε. Probably it was originally confined to short sentences, and only later adapted to speeches of considerable length.

We must now consider two objections. The first refers to the personal pronouns. If we have in reality simply an exclamation of the speaker, ought we not then to retain the pronouns which he would use? Must we not have

σὲ ἀδικεῖν

in place of

ἐκεῖνον ἀδικεῖν?

This objection may be put aside by a reference to the above remarks regarding other *semi-dramatic* and *midway* idioms. The other objection is to the effect that we ought according to the above theory to have αὐτόν in the type

αὐτὸς γὰρ τὴν πόλιν πλεῖστα ὠφελῆσαι.

With ἐγώ in place of αὐτός the construction would have an analogy in the Homeric *nom.*

[1] Not however to be confused with *aposiopesis*.

c. inf. in wishes (v. *supra*): and moreover the same idiom is found in ὥστε sentences and elsewhere, to the influence of which cases we may ascribe the nominative here.

Therefore the essential facts regarding this Greek and Latin idiom are (1) that it has no parallel in modern languages, and (2) that it is of an exclamatory and semi-dramatic nature. The latter characteristic is shared by oblique quotations in other languages.

Regarding the accusative with infinitive in general, the criticisms which we make on the accepted explanations are practically to the effect that they 'hunt the good with one idea.' The final dative, the final and the epexegetic infinitive, have certainly a part in the development of the construction, *e.g.* in the type mentioned by Brugmann in his *Griechische Grammatik*[2] § 170. But we ought not therefore to overlook the predicative dative and the predicate infinitive, and independent constructions where the idiom in question is found. A type so deeply ingrained in both Latin and Greek has been produced not from a single progenitor, but by the concurrence of a variety of usages tending in one and the same direction.

The *nominative with infinitive* requires a few further remarks. In the type

ἔφη αὐτὸς στρατηγεῖν

the nominative is usually ascribed to an attraction. Doubtless this is essentially the case. But here again the construction had its inception in Indo-European times. This is proved by the very ancient Sanskrit idiom which we find illustrated by Delbrück *Altind Syntax* § 220.

Ávikrīto akānisam pínar yán R.V. 4. 24. 9

is literally 'not having sold, I was glad going back.' But the most familiar case is that of *manyate*:

sarpá vái jīryanto 'manyata. T. S. 1. 5. 4. 1.
'the serpents growing old thought'
i.e. 'thought they were growing old'
vivêdāmármaṇo mányamānasya mármа.
R. V. 3. 32. 4.
'found the vital part of him who deemed himself without a vital part.'

Thus we may trace the idiom as follows:—

(1) (*a*) Νέστωρ ἐστὶ γηράσκων.
(*b*) Νέστωρ ἐστὶ γηράσκειν } Νέστωρ γηράσκειν }
(2) (*a*) Νέστωρ οἴεται (*manyáte*) γηράσκων.
(*b*) Νέστωρ οἴεται γηράσκειν.
(3) (*a*) Νέστωρ εὔχεται (φησὶ) γηράσκων.
(*b*) Νέστωρ εὔχεται (φησὶ) γηράσκειν.

The two types 2 (*a*) and 3 (*a*), though not indeed common in Greek, are perfectly admissible, and occur in

νόμιζε ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν ἀποκτείνων. Xen. *An.* vi. 6. 24.
οὐ γὰρ εὐτυχῶν ἀρνήσομαι. Eur. *Alc.* 1158.

for which and other instances v. Goodwin *M.* and *T.*[2] § 910. The infinitive is therefore not epexegetic, but predicative.

Lastly, it will be convenient to refer to a construction which might be urged in support of the theory of an ellipse in the case of the unannounced accusative with infinitive. This is the unannounced optative exemplified in Soph. *Phil.* 615–8

ὑπέσχετο
τὸν ἄνδρ' Ἀχαιοῖς τόνδε δηλώσειν ἄγων·
οἴοιτο μὲν μάλισθ' ἑκούσιον λαβών,
εἰ μὴ θέλοι δ' ἄκοντα·

Goodwin § 675. 2 adds Plato *Phaedo* 95 D. If we have here an omission of ἔλεγεν ὅτι, an important analogy exists in support of the theory of ellipse before the accusative with infinitive. Further, the cases with ὅτι apart from a verb of saying (Goodwin § 695. 1) may be regarding as favouring the ellipse in the former case.

It is not necessary to enter very far into a discussion of this point, since the matter is really stated with admirable simplicity by Brugmann *Gk. Gr.*[2] § 167. But it may be convenient for the sake of clearness to put the theory in the form most suitable for our present purpose. The optative of indirect statement is derived from the optative of indirect question, of which we have many instances in Homer, *e.g.*

ἀλλήλους τ' εἴροντο, τίς εἴη καὶ πόθεν ἔλθοι ρ 368.
ἑτάρους προΐειν πυθέσθαι ἰόντας, οἵτινες ἀνέρες εἶεν. κ 100–1.

The optative is here *potential*, 'who he might be' 'what men they might be,' and its employment is due to the state of uncertainty involved in the question.

A second stage is reached in *Od.* xxiv. 235–8.

μερμήριξε δ' ἔπειτα κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμὸν
κύσσαι καὶ περιφῦναι ἑὸν πατέρ', ἠδὲ ἕκαστα

εἰπεῖν, ὡς ἔλθοι καὶ ἵκοιτ' ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν,
ἥ πρῶτ' ἐξερέοιτο ἕκαστά τε πειρήσαιτο.

Here, though the ὡς ἔλθοι actually depends upon εἰπεῖν, we yet have the idea of doubt present in μερμήριξε, however little it really affects the connection of εἰπεῖν ὡς. The final stage is found in the Hymn to Venus 213–5,

εἶπεν δὲ ἕκαστα
. . . . . .
ὡς ἔοι ἀθάνατος καὶ ἀγήραος ἤματα πάντα,

where ὡς is practically equivalent to ὅτι (cf. Goodwin § 671, Monro [2] § 306). The idea of doubt has entirely disappeared.

This development may be thus explained. In an interrogative or dubitative sentence, since the interrogation or doubt itself implies a variety of possibilities, the potentiality of the mood is inevitably weakened by becoming tautological. Between 'who can he be?' and 'who is he?' there is nothing like the difference which exists between 'it is he' and 'it may be he.' We can therefore understand how a dependent πῶς ἔλθοι; 'how he can have come' was used as practically equivalent to πῶς ἦλθεν; 'how he came.' Then by an attraction μερμήριξεν ὡς ἔλθοι gives rise to an idiom μερμήριξεν εἰπεῖν ὡς ἔλθοι, and finally εἶπεν ὡς ἔλθοι.[1]

What then has happened? In the words of Brugmann *l.c.* 'the optative has through the influence of the governing verb assumed a subjective colour and lost its original sense of uncertainty. A shifting of sense has taken place and the mood assumed a new function belonging only to subordinate sentences.' But since it is the *mood* which has assumed a new tinge and since the ὡς has become a mere joint equivalent to ὅτι, there arises the double possibility (1) of using the mood in the new sense independently, (2) of using it after ὅτι. Of these the second is logically posterior, since ὅτι, a simple link, can affect no construction at all, and as soon as ὡς becomes equivalent to ὅτι, the independent use virtually exists. Therefore *it is incorrect in any particular case of unannounced optative to assume an ellipse of* ἔλεγον ὅτι, *since the mood itself is a sufficient vehicle for the idea of oblique statement.* We need no more assume an ellipse of ὅτι in Sophocles, than an ellipse of πῶς in Homer *Od.* xxiv. 238 (*supra*). There is, in short, no special ellipse, but a conventional oblique acceptance of the mood.

[1] After a verb meaning 'explain' the optative might be again exact; *hence* perhaps the use after 'say.'

This reasoning may be enforced by an example. In Herod. IV. c. 135 we read

οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι ἀσθενείης μὲν εἵνεκεν κατελίποντο, προφάσιος δὲ τῆσδε· δηλαδὴ αὐτὸς μὲν σὺν τῷ καθαρῷ τοῦ στρατοῦ ἐπιθήσεσθαι μέλλοι τοῖσι Σκύθῃσι, οὗτοι δὲ τὸ στρατόπεδον τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον ῥυοίατο.

Here, so far from having an ellipse of ἔλεγεν ὅτι, we have an *equivalent* for these words in the historian's 'ironical' δηλαδή.

So much for the external history of this construction. But it is yet necessary to add something concerning its real significance. What the mood *says* is a potentiality, μέλλοι 'he might be about to,' but what it *means* is a fact 'he said "I am about to."' The truth is that μέλλοι does not correspond at all to μελλω, 'I am about,' but to μέλλοιμι 'I might be about.' This may be supported as follows. In the sentence

ἀλλήλους τ' εἴροντο τίς εἴη καὶ πόθεν ἔλθοι,
ρ 368,

the dependent τίς εἴη does not syntactically correspond to τίς ἐστιν; 'who is he?'; but to a τίς εἴη;[2] 'who might he be?', the vagueness of which form of speech leads to its preference in Oratio Obliqua. Nevertheless it is by *the linguistic convention* understood that the question was τίς εἶ; similarly μέλλοι syntactically implies only μέλλοιμι, but the speaker *understands* the word used to have been μέλλω. Therefore there exists a precise analogy between this idiom and the accusative with infinitive in unannounced oratio obliqua: for—to take the instance which was employed above pp. 378, col. 1, *sqq.*—what the Barbarians really said was a simple statement χώρα—ἐστι, but in order to help us in dramatically regarding them as the speakers, the writer uses a form implying that they *exclaimed* χώραν—εἶναι.

We thus arrive in connection with the unannounced optative at the conclusions which we drew in connection with the unannounced *acc. c. inf.* If these are not mistaken, a common conception of oratio obliqua requires to be completely reversed. For whereas it is often understood that in oratio obliqua we have a modification by the reporter of words uttered by those whom he names, it now appears that from a strictly grammatical or syntactical point of view oblique speech consists of comments by the reporter dramatically ascribed to the subject or subjects. This conclusion seems to me in

[2] Cf. τίς λέγοι; Goodwin, § 242.

any case both logically and historically unavoidable. Logically, because, if the essence of oratio obliqua is a change of persons, then the essence of oratio obliqua is a change of speakers, *i.e.* from the original spokesman to the narrator. Every statement must have grammatically some speaker, and there is no third alternative. What then actually happens? Some languages have no oratio obliqua, and avoid all difficulty by repeating the words actually used, *i.e.* by a complete dramatization. Others, finding this too cumbrous, develope oblique statement, in doing which they are of course obliged to make use of the idioms which they already possess: a sub-dramatic hypothesis is adopted, under which the reporter virtually says to his hearers 'I will make certain comments in the same persons, moods, tenses &c., as I might use in comments originating with myself: but you must with the necessary corrections in the point of view ascribe them to the persons mentioned';[1] In this process two incidents occur: (1) the exact expressions originally used can only approximately be represented, (*e.g.* μέλλοι representing strictly not μέλλω but μέλλοιμι), and (2) the actual usages of the language receive a twist which results in a virtually new type, of which the chief peculiarity is what we might, with reference to 'relative time,' term relative modality: thus μέλλοι, which literally means 'he might be intended,' comes to mean 'he may *then* have been intended,' hence 'he may *then from X's point of view* have been intended' 'he was *then from X's point of view* intended.' Precisely therefore as in the case of 'relative time' a reference to a second time is inserted, so 'relative modality' is produced by an implied reference to a second point of view beside that of the narrator. For this reason indirect discourse is a new departure in the languages where it is found, and deserves in every case to receive a special treatment. In English grammars this seems unfortunately to be for the most part lacking; whence the necessity for these explanations.

F. W. Thomas.

[1] The reporter in fact corresponds to the character in the drama, who when A says to B 'You have insulted me' repeats with a glance at the audience 'He has insulted him,' meaning that A *says* B has insulted him.

EIN NEUER CODEX DES PÄANIUS.

(*Mit neuen unedirten Fragmenten aus der griechischen Uebersetzung des Eutropius.*)

Der Codex No. 812 des Iwironklosters auf dem Berge Athos, ein Bombycinus in 4° aus dem xiv. Jahrhundert, enthält f. 1^{r}–98^{u} ein Traktat unter dem Titel Παιανίου μετάφρασις τῆς εὐτροπίου ῥωμαϊκῆς ἱστορίας. Ἑρμηνεία τῆς ῥωμαϊκῆς ἱστορίας ἣν ἔγραψεν εὐτρόπιος, ἡ δὲ φράσις παιανίου.

Es ist die bekannte griechische Uebersetzung des Breviariums des Eutropius durch Päanius, welche zuerst 1590 von Sylburgius und dann wiederholentlich von Anderen herausgegeben worden ist.[1] Allen diesen Ausgaben lag nur ein und dasselbe Apographon zu grunde, welches Sylburgius vom Franz Pithoeus erhalten hatte. Der Codex selbst gelangte aber nach vielen Schicksalen nach München, und ist der Monacensis CCXIII.

Kein einziger Codex des Päanius war ausser demselben bisher bekannt; es fehlte daher noch immer der Schluss der griechischen Uebersetzung des Päanius, welcher im Monacensis vermisst wird, und ein Theil des VI. Buches, welcher der zweiten Hälfte des 9 (7) Capitels, dem ganzen 10 (8) und dem ersten Stücke des 11 (9) des Eutropius entspricht.

Im Codex vom Iwironkloster, worin der den Päanius enthaltende Theil mit Blättern von Johannes von Antiocheia und einem anonymen Stück aus der römischen Geschichte vermengt ist, befindet sich nun glücklicherweise der ganze mitten im Werke bisher fehlende Theil, so wie auch die Fortsetzung der im Monacensis unvollendeten Uebersetzung. Dieselbe reicht aber nicht ganz bis zum Schlusse, denn es fehlt auch hier wieder gerade das letzte Stück des Schlusses. Immerhin gewinnen wir auch hierin mehr

[1] 1678 von Christophorus Cellarius, 1703 von Thomas Hearne, 1729 von Sigeb. Haverkamp, 1736 von Christian Friedrich Schmid, 1762 von Heinrich Verheyk, 1763 von einem Anonymus zu Braunschweig, 1780 von J. Fried. Salom. Kaltwasser und zuletzt 1807 nebst einer neugriechischen Uebersetzung von Neophytos Dukas zu Wien in der griechischen Druckerei von Georg Vendotos.

als die Hälfte des bisher fehlenden Schlusstheils. Interessant ist es nun zu bemerken, dass die letzten im Athous vorhandenen Zeilen des Päanius sich nicht am Schlusse eines Blattes befinden, noch bricht der Text etwa dadurch ab, dass die folgenden Blätter ausgefallen seien. Dieses ist nicht der Fall; dagegen finden wir sowohl in der zweiten Hälfte der Rückseite des letzten Blattes des Päanius (f. 92^{u}) als auch in den darauf kommenden bis zum Anfang des zweiten Theiles des Codex (f. 93^{z}–98^{u}), worin Dio Cassius enthalten ist, in unmittelbarer Folge der auf uns gekommenen letzten Zeilen der Uebersetzung des Eutropius und ohne jede Unterbrechung ein Fragment aus einem anscheinlich neuen Autor. Des Anfangs bar, ohne in Zusammenhang mit dem Schlusse des Eutropius zu stehen, ist dasselbe ein Stück römischer Kaisergeschichte, welches mit den letzwilligen Verfügungen Caesars anhebt.

Dieser Codex, schon 1880 von mir in meinen Katalog der griechischen Handschriften des Heiligen Berges eingetragen, sollte von mir spätermal genauer untersucht werden. Aus Gründen aber, welche es zu lang wäre hier auseinanderzusetzen, kam ich selbst bei meiner Athosreise im Sommer 1895 nicht dazu. Was aber mir selbst nicht gelang, ist auf mein Verlangen durch meinen Schüler Dr. phil. Philipp Georgandas, z. Z. Director des Athener Volksschullehrerseminars, meinen treuen Gefährten auf beiden Athosreisen, im vorigen Sommer ausgeführt worden. Georgandas hat meinem Auftrage gemäss sowohl den ganzen Text des Päanius verglichen als auch die im Monacensis fehlenden Theile und die mit der Uebersetzung des Eutropius vermengten fremden Blätter genau abgeschrieben.

Indem ich nun auf eine andere Gelegenheit die Publication der in demselben athonischen Codex aufgefundenen Fragmente des Johannes von Antiocheia und der anonymen römischen Geschichte verweise, bin ich schon hier in der Lage, Alles auf Päanius bezüglich herauszugeben. Es sind

I. Ein Verzeichniss der Anfänge der Blätter des Athous in dem den Päanius enthaltenden Theile mit Verweisung auf die Seiten der Ausgabe von Kaltwasser (Gotha, 1780).

II. Die Resultate der Collation desselben Codex zum Texte derselben Ausgabe. Dabei ist zu bemerken, dass zwar Georgandas den Codex mit der ihm mitgegebenen, mir einzig und allein zu Gebote stehenden Ausgabe von Dukas verglichen; da aber dieselbe in aussergriechischen Bibliotheken wohl seltener aufzutreiben ist, habe ich es vorgezogen, seine Collation mit der Ausgabe von Kaltwasser nachzuvergleichen. Der löblichen Direktion der K. K. Hof.- und Staatsbibliothek in München, welche die Güte hatte, mir das Buch zu diesem Zwecke gefälligst nach Athen auszuleihen, spreche ich hier meinen besten Dank aus.

III. Der bisher unedierte Text des Päanius aus dem VI. Buche des Eutropius (VI. 9-11), welcher die bei Kaltwasser (s. 104) mit * * * bezeichnete Lücke ganz ausfüllt.

IV. Die unedierte Fortsetzung am Schlusse (Eutropius X. 11–16).

Diesen beiden neuen Fragmenten gegenüber habe ich den Text des Eutropius nach der Ausgabe von Dietsch (Leipzig, 1875) gegenübergestellt.

Zuletzt bemerke ich dass die Vergleichung des Athous manchen Beitrag zur Verbesserung des Textes in den Ausgaben liefert, oder interessante Varianten bietet. Das Wichtigste darunter stelle ich hier zusammen:

Kaltwasser Seite **18**, Zeile 17—Seite **19**, Zeile 1 *τοῦ βίου τὴν τελευτὴν ἐδέξατο παρ' Ἄγκου υἱὸν* M (onacensis): [1] *ὑπὸ τῶν ἄγκου παίδων ἀνηρέθη* I (wereticus).

20, 2. *Γαβίαν καὶ Σύεσσαν τὴν Πομητίαν* M: *γαβίαν τὴν πομητίαν καὶ σύεσσαν* I.

21, 19. *περαιουμένην μετριωτέραν* M: *περαιουμένην ὥστε μετριωτέραν* I.

39, 9–10. *ἤγουν τιμητὴς* M: desunt I.

58, 6. *καὶ τὴν νίκην διὰ τοῦτο* M: *διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὴν νίκην* I.

60, 16. *ἐπὶ τὸν Τέβριον* M: *περὶ τὸν τίβεριν* I.

60, 22–23. *πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι* M: *πέντε καὶ ὀκτώ* I.

62, 25–**63**, 1. *αἰκισάμενος ἅπαντες διεχρήσατο* M: *αἰκισάμενοι ἅπαντας διεχρήσαντο* I.

71, 4. *ἐπελθεῖν* M: *ἀπελθεῖν* I.

73, 18. *ὑπὸ σπονδ.* (?) M: *ὑποσπόνδους* I.

106, 3–4. *παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν πομπηίῳ ἐν ἀρταξάτου φρουρίῳ δεκάτῳ καὶ ἕκτῳ σημείῳ τοῦ στρατοπέδου ἀπέχοντος τοῦ πομπηίου τοῦ ἀρταξάτου φρουρίου δέκα καὶ ἓξ σταδίοις. τὸ δὲ ἀρτάξατον φρούριον ἦν τοῦ τιγράνου* I.

107, 1. *Σωφανήκην* M: *σωφάνην ἣν* I (scribendum *Σωφανηνὴν*).

153, 11. *στρατιῶτων ὑπεξήγαγε* M: *στρατιωτῶν αὐτὸν ὑπεξήγαγε* I.

167, 1. *καὶ τὸν χαλκὸν μορφοῦντες* M: *καὶ οἱ τὸν χαλκὸν μορφοῦντες* I.

[1] Sowohl hier als in dem weiter unten mitgetheilten Gesammtresultate der Collation verstehen sich die Lesarten des Monacensis nach den Angaben von Kaltwasser, deren Verantwortlichkeit ich nicht übernehmen kann, da ich diesen Codex nicht selbst nachverglichen habe.

167, 7. *καὶ ἐκ τῆς γερουσίας* M : *καὶ τῶν ἐκ τῆς γερουσίας* I.
170, 15–17. *καὶ διὰ τὸ τῶν ὀμμάτων γενόμενον πάθος* M : *καὶ θνήσκει τὸν τρόπον τόνδε· ἐπιρροῆς αὐτῷ τῶν ὀμμάτων γενομένης* I.
170, 18. *δέρματα* M : *δέρμασι* I.
172, 11. *γνωριζόμενος* M : *γνώριμος* I.
174, 21. *καὶ αὐτὸς Διοκλητιανὸς* M : *καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ διοκλητιανὸς* I.
176, 18. *ἑαυτὸν μέχρις* M: *ἑαυτὸν τῶν μέχρις* I.
178, 10. *χειροτονοῦνται* M : *καὶ χειροτονοῦνται* I.
178, 19. *τοῦ βασιλέως* M : *τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως* I.
181, 9. *ἐπαγγέλλει* M : *ἀπαγγέλλει* I.
188, 2–3. *βλάβην* in loco mutilo M addidit Sylburgius : *ζημίαν* I.
188, 4. *ἄλλο...*M : *ἀλλοφύλους* I.

I.

Anfänge der Blätter im Athous.

f. 1 v *τοὺς ἄν*||*δρας* 15, 10.
f. 2 r *βασιλείαν*||*τοῦλλος* 17, 1.
f. 2 v *ῥώμην*||*εἰσῆλθε* 18, 13.
f. 7 r *ἦν*||*ἐπὶ* 20, 9.
f. 7 v *καὶ*||*τῆς* 22, 10.
f. 8 r *ἐπιβάλλοντα*||*τῇ* 24, 5.
f. 8 v *μικρὸν*||*ὕστερον* 26, 7.
f. 9 r *στρατόν.*||*καὶ* 28, 7.
f. 9 v *μετεβλήθησαν.*||*Ἄππιος* 30, 5.
f. 10 r *αὐτῆς*||*καταφεύγοντες* 32, 4.
f. 10 v *αὐτῶν*||*ἑπτὰ* 34, 4–5.
f. 15 r *δ*||*νικήσας* 35, 15.
f. 15 v *εἰκοστὸν*||*γεγονὼς* 37, 8.
f. 16 r *αὐτῷ*||*θανάτου* 38, 18.
f. 16 v *ἠττᾶται*||*τὴν* 40, 1.
f. 17 r *οὗτος*||*πύρρου* 41, 7.
f. 17 v *φιλο*||*φρόνως* 42, 15–16.
f. 18 r *ἔνοικοι*||*πάντες* 43, 24.
f. 18 v *Πύρρου*||*αὐτὸν* 44, 29.
f. 19 r *πόλεμος.*||*τότε* 46, 19–20.
f. 19 v *συνήθεια*||*προσαγορεύει* 48, 3.
f. 20 r *καταποντίσαντες*||*τὸν* 49, 7.
f. 20 v *πο*||*λεμίοις* 50, 2.
f. 21 r *ἐμ*||*πλήσαντες* 51, 13.
f. 21 v *ῥηγοῦλος*||*καίτοι* 52, 15.
f. 22 r . . . . . .
f. 22 v *ῥω*||*μαῖοι* 54, 19.
f. 23 r *γενέσθαι*||*οὕτω* 56, 1.
f. 23 v *οὐ*||*δενὶ* 57, 13.
f. 24 r *διεχρήσατο.*||*ἐφεξῆς* 58, 15.
f. 24 v *σπανίας·*||*τιβέριος* 59, 23.
f. 25 r *ἄπροσ*||*δόκητος* 61, 5.
f. 25 v *οἳ*||*σειν* 62, 12.
f. 26 r *χειροτονηθεὶς*||*περὶ* 63, 16.
f. 26 v *χιλίους.*||*καὶ* 64, 18.
f. 27 r *καρχη*||*δονίων* 66, 1.
f. 27 v *ἅπασιν*||*ἀπέδωκε* 67, 10.
f. 28 r *ἔργοις.*||*ταῦτα* 68, 16.
f. 28 v *μὲν*||*οὖν πλοκῆ* 70, 5.
f. 29 r *τοὺς*||*αἰχμαλώτους* 71, 11.
f. 29 v *οὔπω*||*πρότερον* 72, 13.
f. 30 r *ὑποσπόνδους.*||*θριαμβεύων* 73, 18.
f. 30 v *πέντε*||*μυριάσι* 75, 9.
f. 31 r *βασιλεὺς*||*τῆς* 76, 10.
f. 31 v *αὐτοῦ*||*χιλιάδας* 77, 13.
f. 32 r *κατὰ*||*τῶν* 79, 5.
f. 32 v *αὐτὸν*||*καὶ* 80, 14.
f. 33 r *ἐ*||*ποίησε* 82, 1.
f. 33 v *ποιμήν*||*εἶτα* 83, 8.
f. 34 r *τε*||*λευταῖον* 84, 22.
f. 34 v *παρῆσαν.*||*ἠττήθη* 85, 15
f. 35 r *περι*||*εκαθέσθησαν* 87, 3.
f. 35 v *ῥω*||*μαίους* 87, 26.
f. 36 r *ὑπὸ*||*μαρίου* 89, 7.
f. 36 v *ῥωμαῖοι*||*διὰ* 90, 1.
f. 37 r *κίμβροι*||*καὶ* 90, 22.
f. 37 v *πόλεμος*||*ὡς* 91, 13.
f. 38 r *ἀνεφύη*||*πόλεμος* 92, 13.
f. 38 v *ὥρμησε*||*πρὸς* 93, 11.
f. 39 r *αὐτῷ*||*καὶ* 94, 2.
f. 39 v *ἔλεσι*||*τρεῖς* 94, 21.
f. 40 r *οὐσίαν τὲ*||*τοῦ* 95, 16.
f. 40 v *μάχαις*||*τῇ* 96, 9.
f. 41 r *καὶ*||*πάσης* 97, 4.
f, 41 v *παριόντες*||*ἐπὶ* 97, 3.
f. 42 r *ἐντεῦθεν*||*ἠρεμοῦντες* 99, 10.
f. 42 v *τέλος.*||*ἐν* 100, 14.
f. 43 r *ἄ*||*στυ* 102, 1.
f. 43 v *οἰνόμαον*||*ὀρύξαντες* 102, 22.
f. 44 r *ἀνεκ*||*τήσατο* 103, 19.
f. 44 v *αἴρει*||*πόλιν* 104, 15.
f. 45 r *μα*||*χιμωτάτῳ* desunt M.
f. 45 v *κρατήσας*||*ὅθεν* 104, 16.
f. 46 r *μιθριδάτην*||*μετὰ* 105, 16.
f. 46 v *αὖθις*||*ἐπέθηκεν* 106, 8.
f. 47 r *τῆς*||*αὐτῆς* 107, 15.
f. 47 v *ἐξ*||*ακοσιοστῷ* 108, 5.
f. 48 r *πει*||*ρατῶν* 109, 3.
f. 48 v *καὶ*||*τοῦ* 109, 23–24.
f. 49 r *οὗτος*||*ὀρόδου* 110, 17.
f. 49 v *στράτευμα*||*καταλιπὼν* 111, 13.
f. 50 r *ὁ*||*πομπήιος* 112, 1.
f. 50 v *τῶν*||*ἡγεμόνων* 112, 21.
f. 51 r *ἐνέδρας*||*ἐκινήθη* 113, 15.
f. 51 v *φυγήν.*||*ταῦτα* 114, 11.
f. 52 r *συμμι*||*ξαντες* 115, 12.
f. 52 v *ἡγεμόνες*||*τῆς* 116, 19.
f. 53 r *ὀκτα*||*βιανὸς* 117, 13.
f. 53 v *εἰκοσαετὴς*||*φόβῳ* 118, 11.
f. 54 r *ἐλ*||*θὼν* 119, 8.
f. 54 v *ἠττημένῳ.*||*ἐπανελθόντα* 120, 8.
f. 55 r *τῆς*||*ἡλικίας* 121, 3.
f. 55 v *καθαρθέντα*||*πολέμων* 122, 1.
f. 56 r *ἀφελόμενος*||*ὁμήρους* 123, 14.
f. 56 v *ἁπάντων*||*ἔλαβε* 124, 2.
f. 57 r *καμπανίας*||*ἑβδομήκοντα* 124, 19.

f. 57 v *μησὶ*||*καὶ* 125, 14.
f. 58 r *τὸν*||*πλαύτιον* 126, 11.
f. 58 v *φιλ*||*τάτων* 127, 19.
f. 59 r *τελευτήσαντος*||*ἐπειδήπερ* 128, 17.
f. 59 v *μετὰ*||*τοῦτον* 129, 14.
f. 60 r *φονεὺς*||*ἐξ* 130, 8.
f. 60 v *ποιεῖσθαι*||*τὰ* 131, 4.
f. 61 r *μιμεῖσθαι*||*δὲ* 131, 20.
f. 61 v *βασι*||*λείας* 132, 17.
f. 62 r *μεγαλο*||*ψυχίαν* 133, 18.
f. 62 v *ῥώμῃ*||*κατὰ* 134, 13.
f. 63 r *πᾶσαν*||*εὐφημίαν* 135, 6.
f. 63 v *σχετλιάσαι*||*καὶ* 136, 10.
f. 64 r *λόγων*||*ἢ* 137, 7.
f. 64 v *στρατηγῶν*||*καὶ* 138, 1.
f. 65 r *ἀνθρώπων*||*τοῦ* 138, 19.
f. 65 v *μὲν*||*ἐγένετο* 139, 20.
f. 66 r *ἐν*||*βοσπόρω* 140, 18.
f. 66 v *κατακεκλιμένης*||*ἢ* 142, 7.
f. 67 r *κοινότητα*||*καταμεμφομένων* 142, 27.
f. 67 v *βασιλείαν*||*ἀδριανὸς* 143, 21.
f. 68 r *ἅπασαν*||*καὶ* 145, 9.
f. 68 v *πάμπαν*||*ἀπέχων* 146, 3.
f. 69 r *δὲ*||*τρία* 147, 1.
f. 69 v *τὴν*||*ἀρμενίαν* 147, 21.
f. 70 r *στωϊκοῖς*||*πεπαιδευμένος* 149, 5.
f. 70 v *παρα*||*βάλλεσθαι* 150, 8.
f. 71 r *ἀπο*||*δοῦναι* 151, 9.
f. 71 v *ἀσελγείαις*||*κατὰ* 152, 13.
f. 72 r *ἤρπασεν*||*ἐπιφανὴς* 153, 14.
f. 72 v *τυραν*||*νήσαντα* 154, 17.
f. 73 r *ἑκατὸν*||*σημείοις* 155, 9.
f. 73 v *βίου*||*βασιλεύσας* 156, 11.
f. 74 r *μὲν*||*ὑπὸ* 157, 7.
f. 74 v *συγκλήτου*||*μὴ* 158, 4.
f. 75 r *λαμ*||*πρὸς* 159, 4.
f. 75 v *ἰταλίαν*||*ἦγαγε* 160, 1.
f. 76 r *αἱμιλιανοῦ*||*στρατεύουσιν* 160, 20.
f. 76 v *κα*||*τεγήρασεν* 161, 20.
f. 77 r *καὶ*||*ταράκωνα* 162, 13.
f. 77 v *ὑστε*||*ραίας* 163, 8.
f. 78 r *ἑσπε*||*ρίοις* 164, 13.
f. 78 v *κρίσεως*||*οὐ* 165, 12.
f. 79 r *ἐν*||*θεῖναι* 166, 9.
f. 79 v *περὶ*||*τὸ* 167, 4.
f. 80 r *ἐν*||*δεξιᾷ* 168, 6.
f. 80 v *πολεμι*||*κῶν* 169, 2.
f. 81 r *αὐτῷ*||*τῆς* 170, 5.
f. 81 v *τελευτὴν*||*ἄπρως* 171, 5.
f. 82 r *καὶ*||*μετὰ* 171, 25.
f. 82 v *καταλαμ*||*βάνει* 173, 1.
f. 83 r *βασιλείας*||*καὶ* 174, 3.
f. 83 v *μάλιστα*||*βαρυτάτης* 175, 3.
f. 84 r *αὐτὸν*||*καὶ* 175, 16.
f. 84 v *τῆς*||*ἀλουργίδος* 176, 22.
f. 85 r *ἀδελφῶν*||*καὶ* 177, 15.
f. 85 v *παρελθών·*||*οἰκεῖον* 178, 14–15.
f. 86 r *ἐπει*||*δήπερ* 179, 17.
f. 86 v *τολ*||*μήματος* 180, 17.
f. 87 r *μασσαλία*||*παρασκεναζόμενός τε* 181, 12.
f. 87 v *πόλεμον*||*ἐν* 182, 7.
f. 88 r *πρότερον*||*ἢ* 183, 3–4.
f. 88 v *δω*||*ρεᾶς* 184, 2.
f. 89 r *στρατιωτῶν*||*αὐτὸν* 185, 15.
f. 89 v *κατὰ*||*σαπώρου* 186, 19.
f. 90 r *τυραννήσανται*||*κατὰ* 187, 17.
f. 90 v *ἀποκόψας*||*ὃν* desunt M.
f. 91 r *εἶλεν*||*αἰχμάλωτον* desunt M.
f. 91 v *πάσης*||*τότε* desunt M.
f. 92 r *ῥέων*||*καὶ γὰρ* desunt M.

II.

Collation des Athous.

11, 2 *μεῖον τὲ*. **13**, 2 *ῥωμύλλος*. **14**, 5 *ποιμαίνουσι*, 9–10 *πλεῖστον τὲ*, 11 *ἐνενηκοστῶ*, 12 *ἑαυτοῦ*. **15**, 2 *σενάτορας*, 13 *ἁρπαγὴν*. **16**, 3 *ῥωμύλλον*, 8 *σενάτορες*, 15 *λησταὶ τινὲς*, 17 *ἱερὰ τὲ*. **17**, 1 *τοὔλλος*. **18**, 13 *πρῶτος τὲ*. **18**, 17—**19**, 1 *τοῦ βίου τὴν τελευτὴν ἐδέξατο παρ' Ἄγκου νἱῶν* M : *ὑπὸ τῶν ἄγκου παίδων ἀνηρέθη* I. **20**, 2 *Γαβίαν καὶ Σύεσσαν τὴν Πομητίαν* M : *γαβίαν τὴν πομητίαν καὶ σύεσσαν* I., 4 *ἐν* addidit Sylburgius : deest MI. 5 *ἄρδεων*, **7** *τὴν ἀρχὴν* addidit Sylburgius : desunt MI. **21** *αὐτῆς* pro *ὄντα* Cell. recte suspicaverat Sylburgius ut I docet. 19 *περαιουμένην ὥστε μετριωτέραν*. **23**, 1 *ῥωμαῖοι ταύτῃ τῇ μάχῃ*, 5 *ἐτιμῶσαν*, 9 *πούλβινον*, 20 *πορσύνναν*. **24**, 3 *πορσύννας*, 7 *τουσκώλω*. **25**, 2 *ἶσον*, 3 *ἐνάτω*. **26**, 2 *αὐτὸς* M : *αὐτὴ*, *ὡς* recte supposuit Sylburgius, I. *δικτάτορι*, 16 *αἰτιωμένῳ* addidit Sylburgius : deest MI. **27**, 1 *ἀπέσχεν*, 2 *αὐτῶ*, 3 *οἰονεὶ τινὰς*, 4 *πλήβις*, 8 *βολούσκοι*, 16 *βουλούσκοις*, *ἔφη* MI : *ἔμελλε* Sylburgius. **28**, 4 *βετουλίαν*, 16 *ἀξιοχρέως*, 20 *γίνεται*. **29**, 3 *ἄλκιδον* (et **30**, 7), 13 *ῥωμύλλου*, *φάρας*. **31**, 6 *αἰμίλιος*, 9 *φιδῆναι τὲ*, 18 *ἧττον*, 20 *ἔσχον*. **32**, 5 *καπετώλιον*, 7 7 *φρούριος*, 19 *ῥωμῦλος*. **33**, 5 *ἄρχοντες-ὑπάτων* in margine alia manu addita, 10 *αὐτὴν τὲ εἶλε τὴν βολούσκων πόλιν ὡς καὶ ἑτέραν ἑτρούσκων καὶ σετρίνων ἄλλην*. **34**, 1 *πρενεστίνους*, 6 *πρενεστηνοὺς*, 9 *διεγένετο* deest, 19 *ῥωμῦλλον*. **35**, 3 *μανήλιος*, 12 *δικτάτορος*, 20 *συλλεγῆναι* MI : *συνελέγη* Sylburgius. **36**, 1 *στράτευμα δὲ δεκάδες ἐξ αὐτῶν*, 12 *φρουρίου*, 17 *στρατιωτῶν*. **37**, 5 *ἀπὸ* addidit Sylburgius ex Suida : deest MI. **38**, 6–7 *δικτατορίας* $^{\beta}$*ἔχων* $^{\alpha}$*ἐξουσίαν*, 21 $^{\beta}$*ἑλθεῖν* $^{\alpha}$*αὐτὸν*. **39**, 9 *ἤγουν τιμητὴς* desunt, 11 *διερευνᾶσθαι τὲ*, 12 *πάσης τὲ*, 13 *κήνσορος*, 14 *κήνσορες*, 15 *κενοῖς*. **40**, 12 *τούτω*, 13 *πολλοῖς τὲ*. **41**, 5 *τούτων* MI : *τούτῳ* emendavit Sylburgius, 6 *λεουϊανὸς*, 7 *τοῦ πύρρου*, 8 *αὐτοῦ*, 17 *λουΐνιος*. **42**, 4 *λουκάνοι*, 8 *πρένεστοι*, 15 *εἶδε τὲ*, 22 *μετὰ*, 23 *προσθείη*. **43**, 5 *κιννέας*, 14 *τοῦτο*. 23 *κιννέαν*. **44**, 3 *δεκείω*, 20 *οὗτος ἐστὶν*, 23

ἀπεχώρησεν, τὲ, 26 λεντοῦλος, 29–30 αὐτὸν δὲ. **45**, 8 λικίννιος, 9 καμιλίας. **46**, 3 πίκτορος, 5 πουπλίου ἐμπρωνίου, 8 ἀριμῆνος τὲ, 9 βενεβενδὸς, 10 καὶ ῥηγούλου καὶ νικίου ϋϊοὐνίου, 13 ἐξέπεσαν, 17 πᾶσιν, 18 ὄνομα, 19 ἑκτὸς, 20 γνῶνε. **47**, 5 ἐκ τῆς σικελίας MI: ἐν τῇ Σικελίᾳ emendavit Sylburgius. **48**, 1 ῥῶστρα MI: ῥωστάτας Sylburgius, 2 μεμίχθαι MI: μιμεῖσθαι Sylburgius, ῥάμφει, 14 νίκην τὲ κατεπράξαντο, 18 ἐν ᾧ, 19 ἀκκυλίου. **49**, 10 κλιπέαν, 19 ὀκτὼ τὲ. **50**, 3 χιλιάδας, 5 ἄλλοι, αἰμίλιος, 6 ἐρβίλιος φούλβιος, 13 ἐπάγειν, 16 δουλεῦσαι. **51**, 7 παραχρῆμα τὲ, 10 συνεξῆς I: οὖν ἑξῆς M. γνῆος σκηπίων, 11 ἐξήκοντα, 15 διέφθειρεν, 16 χρησαμένους, 19 ἐξέβαλε, 22 ἰταλικῶν, 24 καὶ κιλίου μετέλου, φρουρίου, 25 γίγνεται. **52**, 5 συνέλαβον τὲ. **53**, 20 αὐτὸν. 21 δαιμονίοις, 22 ἔσχον, 23 τῇ τῶν ἄφρων, **54**, 5 ἐπ' αὐτῷ γὰρ τῷ, 9 καὶ αὐτὸς ποστούμιος, 11 κάτουλος. **56**, 12 σῖτον τὲ. **57**, 1 ῥηγούλων, 2 γεναμένης, 8 ὑπάτων τὲ, 14 ῥωμῦλον, 21 αἰμιλίου. **58**, 2 φάβιος· αὐτὸς καὶ, 4 αἰμίλιος, αὐτοῦ, 6 διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὴν νίκην, 11 σκηπίων. **59**, 7 ἰσπάνην, 16 σαγοῦντοι, αὐτοὺς, 21 σπανίας. **60**, 3–4 ἄλπεις αὐτῶ, 10 βράγχος, 11 ἄφροις ὁ σκηπίων, 16 περὶ τὸν τίβεριν, 17 σκηπίωνι, 22 πέντε καὶ ὀκτὼ χιλιάδας. **61**, 8 αἰμίλιος, 9 βάρων, 19 κένναις. **62**, 25 αἰκισάμενοι ἅπαντας διεχρήσαντο. **63**, 4 ἐν τούτοις ὄντος, 16 νόλαν, 25 συμμαχικὸν quod addidit Sylburgius deest MI. **64**, 6 τορκουάτον, 10 ἐν ἰσπανίαις—ἀσδρούβαν desunt, 13 ἄφρον, 14 τορκουάτος. **65**, 9 σπανίαις. **66**, 13 (et 21) ἰσπανίαις. **67**, 10 ἰσπανοὺς, 14–15 πολύν τε, 22 λοιπῆν πάσαν, 24 μόνων, 26 μεταστᾶσαι quod addidit Sylburgius deest. **68**, 1 πόλεις deest, 4 μετὰ τοῦτον ἐνιαυτῶ, 5 ἰσπάνους, 12 ἰσπάνους, 17 ἰσπανῶν, 22 ἀλιβίου, σαλινάτορος. **69**, 1 πικίλου, 15 ἦγεν, 17 ἰσπάνοις, 18 ἀφρηκὴν. **70**, 1 ἐπιπνοία ἐπεπίστευτο, 5 μὲν οὖν πλοκῆ, στρατίαν, 11 (et 14) νουμίδων, 18 ἀπέλειπεν. **71**, 4 ἀπελθεῖν, 14 τρόπων, 25 πολέμιον, 27 νουμίδων. **72**, 6 τὲ, 20–21 ἐνάτω. **73**, 5 κύντιος φλάμνιος, 9 καὶ προσήλυδας, 14 τὸν δημήτριον, 18 ὑποσπόνδους. **74**, 10 μακεδόνων, 11 γίνεται. **75**, 28 κύντου μάρκου. **76**, 9 ἐτελεύτησεν, 14 ἐπεκέκλητο, 19 νουμίδου, 23 λικίννιος. **77**, 2 τοῖς αὐτῶ, 7–8 παρέδωκεν αὐτῆ μητρὶ, 10–11 ἔφθασε τὲ. **78**, 13 ἐκάλεσε τὲ, 15 καὶ νενικημένους. **79**, 4 τεσσαράκοντα, 6 ἀνίω, 7 γέντιος τὲ, 13 καπετωλίω. **80**, 9 σκιπίων ὁ σκιπίωνος ἔκγονος, 10 τοσοῦτον τῆς, 14 μὲν αὐτων. **81**, 1 οὗτοι ἦσαν, 14 μετὰ τούτου, 19 ἀπελθὼν ἐνίκησε τὲ. **82**, 17 αὐτοὺς. **83**, 1 ἰσπανία, 4 σκηπίων, πουρίανθον, 6 πόλεμον, 12 σκηπίων. **84**, 6 μαγκῖνος, 7 ἐπαναλαβὼν, 19 ἐπαναγὼν. **85**, 2 γάλλων, 15 κρᾶσσος, 18 ταφῆναι προσέταξε. **86**, 9 λούκιον δίλιον. **87**, 3 ἀράβενναν, 4 (et 9) βιτούϊος, 14 ἑξακοσιοστοῦ καὶ τριακοσιοστοῦ, 16 πάλιν, 18 μούκιος καὶ βολᾶς, 20 κορδίσκων. **88**, 4 νουμίδην, 5 ἰεμψάλου καὶ μικίψου, 6 νουμίδων, 8 καρπούρνιος, 9 πρὸς τὸν, 17 κορδίσκους, 18 σκιπίων. **90**, 1 σκιπίων, 15 λουτάντιος. **91**, 2 κατούλω, 8 Μαρσοί τε quod addidit Sylburgius deest MI, 11 ἴσον, 13 ὡς καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ, 14 σκιπίωνα, 17–18 τίτιος, 18 ἀσάνιος τίττος. **92**, 4 ἀεὶ τε συμπλεκόμενος, 6 πεντεκαιδεκάτω, 19 ἠβούλετο. **93**, 6 πρῶτος τὲ. **94**, 17 γίνεται, 21 ἔλεσιν. **95**, 4 ἀπολειπὼν, 16 οὐσίαν τε τοῦ σύλλου καθελόντες, 24–25 χιλιάδας διέφθειρε μὲν ἑξ. **96**, 15 κυλλήνη. **97**, 4 παριόντες. **98**, 7 κενοὶ, 8 ἰσπανίαις, 10 ἰσπανοὺς, 12 παμφυλίαις. **99**, 1 καὶ κίλιος, 3 δομίτιος, 8–9 ὀκτωκαίδεκα, 15 καρδανοὺς τὲ. **100**, 17 γενόμενα. **101**, 13–14 καλχηδόνος. **102**, 9 ἐστὶν, 18 κενὸς. **103**, 5 χειροτονηθέντες, 11 γνέου φιλίου ὀρέστου, 14 λούκιος τὲ, 16 τοῦς, 19–20 ἦν μιθριδάτου. **104**, 1 τάβεραν, 13 δ', 14–15 αἴρει, 16 κρητικὸς προσηγορεύθη, 18 ἀππίων, 19 ἀποθνήσκων ὢν. **105**, 1 δὲ λιβύας, 11 τὸν μὲν μιθριδάτην, 22 ἔσχεν. **106**, 3–4 πομπηίω ἐν ἀρταξάτου φρουρίω δεκάτω καὶ ἕκτω σημείω τοῦ στρατοπέδου ἀπέχοντος τοῦ πομπηίου τοῦ ἀρταξάτου φρουρίου δέκα καὶ ἓξ σταδίοις. τὸ δὲ ἀρτάξατον φρούριον ἦν τοῦ τιγράνου, 9 πάσης τὲ. **107**, 1 σωφάνην ἦν, 10 ἐκδοὺς, 14 πυλαιμένει, 17 πετραίοις, 18 ἀρραβίοις. **108**, 11 συνωμόσαντο τινὲς, 16 συνῦπατος, 19 ἐννενηκοστῶ καὶ ἐνάτω. **109**, 1 θρίαμβοι μὲν, 4 πόποτε, 12 καίσαρ μετὰ, 13 βεβούλου, 14–15 ἐκ ψηφίσματος ἐπεπέμφθη Sylburgio addita desunt MI, 16 σελβητίους. **110**, 2 εἶλε τὲ 7 ἐν ῥαβένναις, 11 καὶ ἑπτακοσιοστὸν ἔτος μάρκος, 15 καὶ μετὰ, 20 λειπόμενων. **111**, 22 δικτάτορα, 23 ἰσπανίας, 26 ἀφρόνιος. **112**, 20 ὤφειλεν, 21 ματὰ. **113**, 2 μικρῶ, 19 τῶ θώρακι κεκαλυμμένον ἔτι. **114**, 7–8 αἰμίλιον λεπίδιον, 9 δικτάτορα, 14 ἰώβαν, 18 βάρων. **115**, 8 καίσαρ τέταρτον, 9 ἰσπανίας. **116**, 10 περιόντος quod Sylburgius addidit deest MI, 17 τὲ καὶ τῶν, 20 ἑκόντες. **117**, 12–13 ὕπατοι πάντες καὶ ἰόρτιος, 14 ἐνιαυτοὺς, 18 τὲ ὕστερον. **118**, 1 δικτάτορι. **119**, 10 φόνον, 12 βεντίδος. **120**, 3 ἀποπέμψας quod addidit Sylburgius deest MI, 4 αἰγύπτου deest, 12 ἧττον τὲ, 21 τοῦτον τὲ. **122**, 2 τοῖς ὑπάτοις, 3 καλαβρία, 3 δαλματία. **123**, 1 κάλασσος, 6 ἄλβερον, 15 δὴ καὶ τὰ, 17 σὺν γράκχω μεμαχομένοι, 18 αὐτόν τοι, 22 πόλλιον. **124**, 9 συσταίη τοὺς, 16 καισάρειαν ζάχλην πρότερον, 17 καὶ τριακοστῶ, 20 μεγίστην δὲ. **125**, 16 θεῖος a Sylburgio restitutum deest MI. **126**, 4–5 πρόγονον, 6 τὲ αὐτοὺς, 7 γνέου μαντίου τῶν στρατηγῶν, 10 ὅλος. **127**, 1 καπετώλιον, 2 τὲ τέσσαρας, 7 γάϊον deest, 15 τὲ, 17 ὀρχηστὰς τὲ καὶ, 18 ἐπιδεικνυμένων. **128**, 13 ἐγένετο

quod non recte voluit addere Sylburgius deest MI, 16 *συγχωροῦντος τότε πολέμωνος βασιλεύοντος*, 17 *σκόττου*. **129**, 18 *ἱσπανοί*. **130**, 14 *βετέλλιος*. **131**, 5–6 *ἐπήγαγεν ἑαυτῷ*, 15 *πάντας*, 18 *δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ δισμυρίους*. **132**, 8 *καπετωλίω*. **133**, 7 *καὶ τρισὶ*, 12 *μὴδὲ*. **134**, 16, *ὑπήκοων*, 19 *ἀθηνῶν*, 22 *γενεθλιαλογήσας*, 26 *βασιλεύειν*, 27–**135**, 2 *ἐτελεύτησε δὲ ἐνάτω καὶ ἑξηκοστῷ τῆς ἡλικίας ἔτει τῆς βασιλείας δὲ ἐνάτω καί ἡμέραις ἑπτά*. **135**, 15 *κατηγωνίσατο* deest. **136**, 2 *ἔξω συνωμοσίας*, 11 *εἶπεν*. **137**, 5 *τίττω*, 23 *καπετωλίω*, 24 *χείρας* 24 *κάθους*. **138**, 4 *καπετώλιον*, 6 *τὲ ἐπὶ*. **139**, 2–3 *ἥττων*. **140**, 9 *ἴστρον*, 11 *θαιφαλοὶ*, 18 *ὀσδροήνων*, 20 *ἀρδουήνων*. **141**, 4 *κτῆμα τὲ, αὐτῷ*, 7 *κατώκησεν*. **142**, 14 *φιλοδωρότατος τὲ*, 21 *βουλευτὴς* quod addidit Sylburgius deest MI, 27 *δὴ τινῶν*. **143**, 3 *τῆς ἐν σελευκεία*, 16 *συνήει*. **145**, 13 *ἐτελεύτησέ τε*, 25–26 *ἐξισωθεὶς τοὔνομα πομπιλίω*. **146**, 9 *προίστατο*, 19 *πίος δὲ*. **147**, 1 *καὶ καθιερώθη καὶ*, 3 *ἀντωνίνος*, 9 *λούκιος ἄννιος ἀντωνίνος*, 15 *δὲ ἀνεψιᾶ*. **148**, 6 *τὲ τὴν*, 11 *ὁ* quod addidit Sylburgius deest, *ἀξιῶν*. **149**, 3 *τούτων αὐτῶν*, 15–16 *καρχηδονίω*, 16–17 *χερρονήσω*, 18 *φρόντωνι τότε*. **150**, 17 *σίλβων*. **151**, 3 *αὐτῶν*, 6 *παρασκευὴν*, 10 *δὲ μὴ*, 11 *ἐπιτρέψαι τὲ κατὰ*. **152**, 8 *λαμπρόν τι* quae addidit Sylburgius desunt MI, 16–17 *πρὸς τοῦτο*. **153**, 11 *στρατιωτῶν αὐτὸν*. **154**, 2 *μουβία*, 4–5 *σέβηρος ἀφρὸς*, 6 *λέρκις*, 23 *τὲ παρθικὸς*, 24 *ἀδιαβενικός*, 26–27 *σαβῖνος*. **155**, 7 *ἀρχὰς*, 11 *βορακίω*, 17 *βασσιανὸς*. **156**, 1–2 *καρακάλλου*, 10 *ὀσδροήνης*, 13 *ἐγένοντο τὲ*, 15 *ὀφίλιος*, 17 *αὐτῷ*, 22 *ὡς, καρακάλλου*. **157**, 5 *σευῆρα*, 7 *τὴν στρατιὰν*. **158**, 7 *νῦν τῶν μὲν*, 11 *δὲ καὶ ὁ παῖς αὐτῷ*. **159**, 8 *ἀλβιανὸς*, 16 *γίνεται*, 25 *τοῦτον*. **160**, 9 *μουδαλίας*, 12–13 *λουτρόν τε τῇ ῥώμῃ*, 18 *ὑποδέχεται*, 20 *αἰμιλιανοῦ*. **161**, 2 *ἐξ*, 5 *αἰμιλιανὸς*, 9–10 *ῥητείας*, 12 *γαλλίηνος*, 15 (et 21) *ἀδρανία*, 25 *γένουόν*. **162**, 4 *πᾶσας*, 5 *ἀλαμάννους*, 8–9 *ἐγεγόνεσαν*, 9–10 *ῥωμαίων ἀλλὰ τὲ*, 11 *ἴστρον*, 13 *ἰσπανίας*, 21 *ἐνιαυτοῖς*, 22 *ἐπενδειξάμενος*. **163**, 1 *δημογοτικῶν*, 11 *γάμοις* quod addidit Sylburgius deest MI, 13 *ἔτος ἄγοντα*. **164**, 2 *τέττρικον*, 5 *βουραιγάλλοις*, 8 *ὀδέναθος*, 12 *ἐπολιόρκει*, 16–17 *οὐαλεριανὸς ἀδελφὸς*, 20 *ἴστρον*. **165**, 8–9 *καπετωλίω ἐψηφίσατο τὲ*, 9 *τῷ* quod Sylburgius addidit deest MI, 12 *ἴσον*. **166**, 1 *ἴστρον*, 3 *τεττρίκου*, 16 *ἀπήγαγε, αὐτὴν τὲ, τέττρικον*, 19 *τέττρικός*, 21–22 *καὶ αὐτὴ μικρὸν*, 24 *οἱ ἀπόγονοι*. **167**, 1 *καὶ οἱ τὸν*, 7 *καὶ τῶν ἐκ, φθονῶν*, 14 *πλοῦτον τὲ*, 16 *ἴστρον*. **168**, 3 *κατωκισθέντας*, 6 *μυσέων*, 24 *μόνους*. **169**, 7 *ἀγριπίνη*, 10 *στρατιωτικῆ τεχνησάμενος*, 11 *ἄγρεον*, 15 *εἰρηναῖα*, 19 *αὐρηλλιανῶ*. **170**, 3 *κάρος ἀνὴρ βωνήνσιος*, 14 *ὁ* deest, 15 *ἄπρως*, 15–17 *αὐτῶ καὶ θνήσκει τὸν τρόπον τόνδε· ἐπιρροῆς αὐτῶ κατὰ τῶν ὀμμάτων γενομένης οὐ δυνάμενος*, 18 *δέρμασι*. **171**, 1 *ἄπρως*, 19 *ἀνουλίου*, 21 *ἀνωμόσατο*, 23 *ἄπρων*. **172**, 7 *ἄμανδον τὲ, αἰμιλιανὸν*, 8 *ἔρκουλον*, 11 *γνώριμος*, 12 *πολιτικῶν*, 13 *βογωνίαν, γελβίκην*, 14 *ἅλμορχον*, 19 *συναγείραι*. **173**, 12 *σαρδίκην*, 15 *ἐρκούλου*, 19 *δὲ* deest. **174**, 18 *ἀλαμάννους*, 21 *αὐτὸς δὲ*. **175**, 4 *πάσης τῆς βασιλευομένης*, 6–7 *ἅπερ εἰς*, 10 *ὁρμίσδη*. **176**, 18 *ἑαυτὸν τῶν*, 21 *ἐρκούλιος* (et infra). **177**, 9 *ἰδιώτας*, 16 *ἐρκούλιος ἐν σάλωσι διοκλητιανὸς δὲ περὶ τὴν λουκανίαν ἐν ἀγρῷ γειτνιῶντι σάλωσι*. **178**, 4 *γαλέριος*, 10 *καὶ χειροτονοῦνται*, 13 *μόνων*, 16 *καὶ* deest, 19 *τὴν τοῦ*. **179**, 2 *ἀργυρά*, 9 *βορακίω*, 18 *πρὸ* deest MI, 19 *μαξιμιανὸν*, 20 *σευῆρον*, 21 *πολλοὶ γὰρ*. **180**, 1 *πραιτανίας*, 2 *γεγεννημένος*, 16 *σεύηρον*. **181**, 4 *φράγκους, ἀλαμάννους*, 9 *ἀπαγγέλλει*, 19 *γαλέριος*, 27 *μαξιμιανὸς*. **182**, 6 *μαξιμιανὸς*. **183**, 10 *ἀδελφοῦ*, 16 *διαλάμψας*, 19 *ἀλλ' ἐκείνων ταύτης ἦν σκύθας τοι*. **184**, 1 *ἀντείχετο* quod addidit Sylburgius deest MI, 3 *τούτου*. **185**, 18 *πολιορκῶν* quod addidit Sylburgius deest MI, 19 *ἐνστρεφόμενον*. **186**, 8 *ἱσπανίας, ἔλει*, 13 *τὸν φόβον*, 19 *τοῦ κατὰ*. **187**, 14 *ἐγίνετο κοινὸν*, 16 *κωνσταντίου* a Sylburgio additum deest MI, 19–20 *ὁγδόη*, 27 *μουρσῆ*, **188**, 2–3 *κοινοῖς ζημίαν· πολλὴν γὰρ*, 4 *ἀλλοφύλλους*.

III.

Unediertes Fragment aus dem VI. Buche des Eutropius.

Cod. 44 v ...[*πόλιν*] *ἁρμοζιανήν· εἶτα καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν τιγράνην ἐπιόντα μετὰ μὲν ὁπλιτῶν ἑπτακισμυρίων καὶ πεντακοσίων τρισὶ δὲ πλειόνων μυριάσι τοξοτῶν, αὐτὸς σὺν ὀκτακισχιλίοις καὶ μυρίοις οὕτως ἐνίκησεν, ὡς ἅπασαν σχεδὸν διαφθαρῆναι τὴν ἁρμενίων δύναμιν. διαβὰς δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν νίσιβιν αἴρει* (scrib. *αἱρεῖ*) *τὴν πόλιν σὺν τῷ τοῦ βασιλέως ἀδελφῷ. τῶν δὲ ὑπὸ λουκούλου καταλελειμμένων ἐπὶ φυλακῇ τῶν κτηθέντων ῥαθυμούντων ἅμα καὶ τῇ περὶ τὰ χρήματα σπουδῇ τὸ πλέον νεμόντων, αἰτία γίνεται τῷ μιθριδάτῃ πάλιν ἐπιχειρῆσαι τῷ πόντῳ· καὶ παρασκευῆς*

Eutrop. vi. 9. ...civitatem Arzanenae, nobilissimam regni Armeniaci, cepit, ipsum regem cum sexcentis milibus clibanariorum et centum milibus sagittariorum et armatorum venientem xviii. milia militum habens ita vicit, ut magnam partem Armeniorum deleverit. Inde Nisibin profectus eam quoque civitatem cum regis fratre cepit. Sed ii, quos in Ponto Lucullus reliquerat cum exercitus parte, ut regiones victas et jam Romanorum tueruntur, negligenter se et avare agentes occasionem iterum Mithridati

ἐπεμελεῖτο εἰς πόλεμον· οὐ μὴν ἀξιόχρεων τοῦτο ἐφάνη λουκούλλω τὴν κατὰ τῶν περσῶν ἐπιστράτευσιν ἀνακόψαι· κἂν ἔπραξέ τι κατ' αὐτῶν γενναῖον, εἰ μὴ τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτὸν ἔπαυσαν ῥωμαῖοι. ὁ δὲ ἕτερος λούκουλλος· ὃ τὰ περὶ μακεδονίαν ἐπετέτραπτο· πρῶτος ἐπήγαγε βέσσοις πόλεμον· ἔθνει θρακῶν μα-
Cod. 45 r χιμωτάτω· καὶ κρατήσας αὐτῶν ἐν ταῖς ὑπωρείαις τοῦ αἵμου ἀφείλετο καὶ τῆς πόλεως αὐτοὺς τῆς οὐσκουδάμης· εἶλε δὲ καὶ τὴν καβύλην· καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν χωρήσας, τὸν ἴστρον, πολλὰς τῶν τοῦ πόντου πόλεων ἐπολιόρκησεν· ἀπολλωνίαν καὶ κάλλαβον καὶ παρθενόπολιν τόμους τὲ ἐπὶ ταύταις καὶ ἱερὸν καὶ βουρζάονα· κατορθώσας γὲ οὕτω τὸν πόλεμον, οἴκαδε ἐπανῆκεν· καὶ θριαμβεύουσιν ἑκάτεροι λούκουλλοι· ἐπιφανέστερον δὲ ὁ μιθριδάτην νενικηκὼς· ὡς ἐπὶ πολλαῖς ἅμα βασιλείαις ἃς καθηρήκες τὸν θρίαμβον ἄγων· ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν μακεδόνων, οὐκέτ' ἐκινεῖτο· μιθραδάτης δὲ ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἦν ἔτι· τὴν γὰρ ἀναχώρησιν λουκούλλου καιρὸν αὐτοῦ ποιησάμενος συνέλεγε στρατείαν. παρασκευαζομένου δὲ ἐκείνου, κρῆτες ἐπανέστησαν· ἐφ' οὓς ἐξεπέμφθη κύντος καὶ κίλλιος μέτελλος καὶ τρισὶν ἔτεσι ταύτην κατέλυσε τὴν κίνησιν· λαμπρῶς κρατήσας [ὅθεν].

in Pontum irrumpendi dederunt, atque ita bellum renovatum est. Lucullo paranti capta Nisibi contra Persas expeditionem successor est missus.

Eutrop. vi. 10. Alter autem Lucullus, qui Macedoniam administrabat, Bessis primus Romanorum intulit bellum atque eos ingenti proelio in Haemo monte superavit. Oppidum Uscudamam, quod Bessi habitabant, eodem die, quo aggressus est, vicit, Cabylen cepit, usque Danubium penetravit. Inde multas supra Pontum positas civitates aggressus est. Illic Apolloniam evertit, Calatin, Parthenopolin, Tomos, Histrum, Burzaonem cepit belloque confecto Romam rediit. Ambo tum triumphaverunt, Lucullus, qui contra Mithridaten pugnaverat, majori gloria, cum tantorum regnorum victor redisset.

Eutrop. vi. 11. Confecto bello Macedonico, manente Mithridatico, quod recedente Lucullo rex collectis auxiliis reparaverat, bellum Creticum ortum est. Ad id missus Q. Caecilius Metellus ingentibus proeliis intra triennium omnem provinciam cepit.

IV.

Unedierter Schluss.

Cod. 90 r ...[ἀλλο] φύλλους τὸν ἀγῶνα εἶχον. μαγνεντίου τοίνυν δυνάμεις ἑτέρας συναγείραντος εὐλαβηθεὶς, περὶ τῶν ἑώων κωνστάντιος τὸν ἀνεψιὸν γάλλον καίσαρα χειροτονήσας ἐξέπεμψεν εἰς ἕω· αὐτός τε εἶχετο τοῦ πρὸς μαγνέντιον ἔργου· καὶ δὴ μάχαις ἑτέραις περικόψας αὐτῷ τὰς ἐλπίδας συνήλασεν εἰς λουγδοῦνον· οὗ, βιαίαν ἐπήγαγεν ἑαυτῷ τελευτήν· τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σενῶνας προτέρου τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποκόψας.

Cod. 90 v ὃν καίσαρα χειροτονήσας ἐπέστησε ταῖς γαλλίαις· ὅτε ἀντεξῆγε κωνσταντίῳ τὴν δύναμιν· τρίτον δὲ ἦν αὐτῷ τῆς βασιλείας ἔτος καὶ μῆνες ζ'.

Οὕτω δὴ τὸν ἐμφύλιον καταπαύσας πόλεμον ὁ κωνστάντιος ἐπειδήπερ ἐπύθετο γάλλον ἀτόπως χρῆσθαι τῇ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐξουσία ἀπειρημένον τὲ εἶναι καὶ τυραννίδι μᾶλλον ἢ βασιλεία πρέπειν, τὸν μὲν ἀνεῖλε· σιλβανὸν δὲ ἐν γάλλοις νεωτερίσαντα· τριακοστῇ καθεῖλε τὲ καὶ διέφθειρεν ἡμέρα· μόνος τὲ τῶν πάντων ἐγένετο κύριος· ἐπανόδου δὲ ἐπιθυμῶν τὸν ἀνεψιὸν ἰουλιανὸν ἀδελφὸν ὄντα τοῦ γάλλου· καίσαρα χειροτονήσας ἐξέπεμψεν εἰς τὰς γαλλιάς συνάψας αὐτῷ τὴν ἀδελφὴν εἰς γάμον· οὗτος ἀνώρθωσε τὰ πράγματα ὀξέως· ἤδη κείμενα καὶ πεπτωκότα· τῶν τε γὰρ προσοικούντων βαρβάρων πολλαῖς ἐκράτησε μάχαις τήν τε τῶν οἰκείων πολιορκίαν μετέστησεν εἰς τὴν βαρβάρων· οὐδὲ ἀξιομάχω

Eutrop. x. 12. ...Ingentes Romani imperii vires ea dimicatione consumptae sunt, ad quaelibet bella externa idoneae, quae multum triumphorum possent securitatisque conferre. Orienti mox a Constantino Caesar est datus patrui filius, Gallus. Magnentiusque diversis proeliis victus vim vitae suae apud Lugdunum attulit imperii anno tertio, mense septimo, frater quoque ejus Senonis, quem ad tuendas Gallias caesarem miserit.

Eutrop. x. 13. Per haec tempora etiam a Constantio multis incivilibus gestis Gallus Caesar occisus est, vir natura ferus et ad tyrannidem pronior, si suo jure imperare licuisset. Silvanus quoque in Gallia res novas molitus ante diem trigesimum exstinctus est, solusque imperio Romano eo tempore Constantius princeps et Augustus fuit.

Eutrop. x. 14. Mox Julianum caesarem ad Galliam misit, patruelem suum, Galli fratrem, tradita ei in matrimonium sorore, cum multa oppida barbari expugnassent, alia obsiderent, ubique foeda vastitas esset, Romanumque imperium non dubia jam calamitate nataret. A quo modicis copiis

πρὸς τὰ βαρβαρικὰ πλήθη χρώμενος δυνάμει καὶ πολὺ πλῆθος ἀλαμανικὸν διαφθείρας· ἐπὶ πᾶσι τὸν βασιλέα τοῦ ἔθνους εἷλεν

Cod. 91 r αἰχμάλωτον πρὸς ἀργεντοράτῳ τῇ πόλει· τοῖς γάλλοις δὲ ἐπανήγαγε τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν· συνεχῶς ἐπεξιών τε τοῖς πολεμίοις καὶ νικῶν ὥς τε αὐτοὺς ὑπὲρ τὸν ῥῆνον συγκλεισθέντας μηκέτι κατεγχειρεῖν ἐξόδου· ταῦτα γνοὺς κωνστάντιος ἐκέλευσε τὴν στρατιὰν ἀναχωρῆσαι τῶν γαλλιῶν οὐ μετρίως φέρων τὰς περὶ ἰουλιανοῦ φήμας· τότε τοίνυν αὔγουστος παρὰ τοῦ στρατοπέδου καὶ ἄκων ἀνερρέθη ἰουλιανὸς ἐνιαυτῷ τε ὕστερον ὅλῳ τῆς ἀναρρήσεως ἦκεν ἐπὶ ἰλλυρίους ὡς προσθήσων αὐτοὺς τῇ βασιλείᾳ· κωνστάντιον γὰρ, ὁ περσικὸς κατεῖχε πόλεμος· ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐπύθετο ταύτης τῆς ἰουλιανοῦ ὁρμῆς ὁ κωνστάντιος· ἐκίνησε τὴν κατ' αὐτοῦ στρατιὰν σαφῶς ἐμφύλιον ἀράμενος πόλεμον ἀλλ' ἐτελεύτησε μεταξὺ καππαδοκῶν τε καὶ κιλίκων ἐν μουκρήναις τῷ χωρίῳ· τριάκοντα πρὸς τοῖς ὀκτὼ βασιλεύσας ἐνιαυτούς· γενόμενος ἔτη πέντε καὶ τεσσαράκοντα· συνεψηφίσθη τε τοῖς θεοῖς ἀνὴρ, ἥμερός τε καὶ φιλάνθρωπος· καὶ περὶ τὰς φιλίας πιστός· πλὴν ὅτι ταῖς τῶν γαμετῶν ἐδούλευε γνώμαις· καὶ τοῖς τε φίλοις· καὶ τοῖς οἰκειοτάτοις πάντων μετεδίδου τῶν ἀγαθῶν τοὺς ἀξίους τε τιμῶν οὐκ ἀπεστέρει τῶν ὀφειλομένων· ὠμότητός τε ἀπήλλακτο πάσης.

Cod. 91 v τότε μόνον αὐτῇ χρώμενος, ὅτε τίς αὐτὸν ὑποψία κατέσχεν ὡς ἐπιβουλευομένης αὐτῷ τῆς βασιλείας· τὰ δὲ τῆς τύχης αὐτοῦ πρὸς τοὺς ἐμφυλίους ἢ τοὺς βαρβαρικοὺς πολέμους ἐτύγχανε δεξιώτερα· καθίσταται δὲ ἰουλιανὸς τοῦ παντὸς κύριος· καὶ πάσῃ παρασκευῇ κατὰ Περσῶν ἐστράτευσε· πολλὰ δὲ τῶν περσικῶν ἑλὼν φρουρίων ἐκδιδόντων αὐτὰ τῶν φυλάκων τῆς πολιορκίας ἀναγκαζούσης ἐκπεπορθημένης ἤδη τῆς συρίας τὰς παρεμβολὰς ἐστήσατο πρὸς αὐτῇ κτησιφῶντι· καὶ εἰ μέτρον ἐπέθηκε τῷ πολέμῳ, τάχα ἂν ἐπανῆλθε σῶος· ἀλλ' ἐπανιὼν καὶ τοῖς προκατωρθωμένοις θαρρῶν, ἀφυλακτότερον ἀνεστρέφετο ταῖς μάχαις· καὶ βληθεὶς ὑπό τινος τῶν πολεμίων, τὸν βίον ἀπέλιπεν· ἕκτῃ καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ ἰουλίου μηνός· τρίτῳ τῆς βασιλείας ἔτει· τῆς δὲ ἡλικίας, τριακοστῷ καὶ ἐνί· ἀνὴρ ἀξιαγασθῆναι καὶ μέγιστος ἐσόμενος τοῖς κοινοῖς ὄφελος· εἰ μὴ τὰ τῶν μοιρῶν ἐκράτησε· γλῶττα μὲν γὰρ αὐτῷ πρὸς ἑκατέραν ἠκόνητο φωνὴν τήν τε βασιλεύουσαν καὶ τὴν ἑλλάδα, ὥστε κρατεῖν μὲν αὐτὸν ἐν ἀμφοτέραις· αὐτῶν δὲ αὐτοῦ κρατεῖν θατέρα τῇ τῶν ἑλλήνων· ῥέων.

Cod. 92 r καὶ γὰρ ἐν τῷ λέγειν πολὺς, ὑπερέβαινε τοῦτο τὸ θαῦμα τῇ μνήμῃ τῶν ἀρχαίων· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἦν ὃ μὴ διὰ στόματος ἦγε· τῶν ταῖς ἀκοαῖς ἅπαξ ἐμπεσόντων· τὰ δὲ τῆς βιοτῆς αὐτῷ φιλοσοφίας ἐγγύτερα· καὶ μὴν καὶ περὶ τὰς φιλίας ἐπιμελὴς ἦν καὶ πιστότατος ἁπάντων· πλὴν οὐ δοκιμάζων ἐξ ἀρχῆς προΐετο· οὐδὲ βασιλικῶς ἐβασάνιζε τοὺς ἐσομένους φίλους· ὅθεν ἤδη καὶ μῶμον ἐκ τῆς τινῶν ἔσχε συνουσίας·

apud Argentoratum, Galliae urbem, ingentes Alamannorum copiae exstinctae sunt, rex nobilissimus captus, Galliae restitutae. Multa postea per eundem Julianum egregie adversum barbaros gesta sunt summotique ultra Rhenum Germani et finibus suis Romanum imperium restitutum.

Eutrop. x. 15. Neque multo post, cum Germaniciani exercitus a Galliarum praesidio tollerentur, consensu militum Julianus factus Augustus est, interjectoque anno ad Illyricum obtinendum profectus Constantio Parthicis bellis occupato. Qui rebus cognitis ad bellum civile conversus in itinere obiit inter Ciliciam Cappadociamque anno imperii octavo et trigesimo, aetatis quinto et quadragesimo, meruitque inter Divos referri, vir egregiae tranquillitatis, placidus, nimis amicis et familiaribus credens, mox etiam uxoribus deditior, qui tamen primis imperii annis ingenti ac modestia egerit, familiarium etiam locupletator neque inhonoros sinens, quorum laboriosa expertus fuisset officia, ad severitatem tamen propensior, si suspicio imperii moveretur, mitis alias, et cujus in civilibus magis quam in externis bellis sit laudanda fortuna.

Eutrop. x. 16. Hinc Julianus rerum potitus est, ingentique apparatu Parthis intulit bellum, cui expeditioni ego quoque interfui. Aliquot oppida et castella Persarum in deditionem accepit vel vi expugnavit, Assyriamque populatus castra apud Ctesiphontem stativa aliquamdiu habuit. Remeansque victor, dum se inconsultius proeliis inserit, hostili manu interfectus est vi. Kalend. Julias imperii anno septimo, aetatis altero et trigesimo. Atque inter divos relatus est, vir egregius et rem publicam insigniter moderaturus, si per fata licuisset. Liberalibus disciplinis apprime eruditus, Graecis doctior, atque adeo, ut Latina eruditio nequaquam cum Graecia scientia conveniret, facundia ingenti et prompta, memoriae tenacissimae, in quibusdam philosopho proprior. In amicos liberalis, sed minus diligens, quem tantum principem decuit. Fuerunt enim nonnulli, qui vulnera gloriae ejus inferrent. In provinciales justissimus. . . .

μάλιστα δὲ δικαιοσύνης[1] ἐνεχθείσης αὐτῷ
κατὰ τὴν ἐπιδημίαν ἣν αὐτὸς προέ-
γραψεν· ἔτι περιὼν τῇ τῶν ἑλλήνων
πολιτείᾳ· καισαρίων ἐπεκαλεῖτο·
κατὰ δὲ τοὺς πατρώους νόμους ἐν
διαθήκαις εἰσποιητὸν ἀπέφηνε τὸν
υἱὸν τῆς ἀδελφιδῆς ἀτίας ὀκταο-
ύιον· προσέτι μέντοι καὶ κληρονό-
μον τῆς οὐσίας· ἀλλ' ὅτε δὲ ἀπ'
ἐκείνου στοῖχος τῆς συγγενείας
τοιοῦτος ἦν; μία θυγάτηρ αὐτοῦ
ἰουλία γαΐῳ πομπηίῳ γαμηθεῖσα
προετελεύτησεν· ἡ δὲ ἀδελφὴ ἰου-
λία τῶν ἱππικῶν τινὶ ἀτίῳ γαμη-
θεῖσα· δύο θυγατέρας ἔσχεν· ὧν ἡ
μὲν συνώκησε γαΐῳ φιλίππῳ καὶ
γενεὰν οὐκ ἀπέλιπεν· ἡ δὲ ὀκταουίῳ
στρατηγικῆς ὄντως τιμῆς· τόν τε
δὴ προειρημένον· ὀκταούϊ-
Cod. 92 v ον . . . . . .

SPYR. P. LAMBROS.

Athen.

[1] Von hier an gehört der Schluss des Blattes dem Stücke aus der römischen Geschichte des Anonymus an.

FRAGMENT OF AN EARLIER EDITION OF APOLLONIUS'S HOMERIC LEXICON.

IN 1895 the Bodleian Library acquired from Mr. B. P. Grenfell a considerable number of fragments which he had just brought back from Egypt. When I came to arrange them for glazing and to reference them, I found among them three small pieces of papyrus, written in a clear, thin, majuscule hand, containing Homeric words. It took a very short time to discover that they fitted on to each other and formed part of Apollonius's Homeric lexicon—either in its original state, or at least in a state far more nearly original than that in which it has come down to us. A short statement of the facts was made in my annual report to the Curators, printed in the summer of 1896, but want of time has hitherto prevented my publishing the text of the fragments. I now offer them with the *lacunae* filled in to the best of my power of conjecture, and prefix for comparison the corresponding portion of the printed text of Apollonius. That text, which I take from Bekker's edition (1833),[1] is preserved in a single MS. of the tenth century. The fragments can scarcely be later than the early part of the second century, and Dr. Kenyon confirms my belief that they may be reasonably attributed to the first century, to which provisionally I assign them.

[1] Its ligatured forms, however, are here printed *in extenso*.

Current Text of Apollonius.

ἐφέπεσκον ἐπεπορεύοντο.
ἐφέποντες ἐπερχόμενοι.
ἐφετμή ἐντολή.
ἐφεψιόωνται ἐμπαίζουσιν.

ἐφημοσύνης ἐντολῆς.
ἐφήσω ἐπισκήψω, ἐντελοῦμαι.
ἐφιέμενος ἐντελλόμενος.
ἔφλυε. τῶν πεποιημένων ἡ λέξις· "ἀνὰ δ' ἔφλυε καλὰ ῥέεθρα."
ἐφόλκαιον ἐφόλκιον, ἀπὸ τοῦ δι' αὐτοῦ ἐφέλκεσθαι τὴν ναῦν. σημαίνει δὲ καράβια μικρά. οἱ δὲ τὸ πηδάλιον. καὶ μᾶλλον τοῦτ' ἂν εἴη· οὐ γὰρ ἐφολκίῳ ἐχρῶντο τότε.
ἐφράσθην ἐνόησας.
ἔφυδρος ὕδωρ ἐπάγων.
Ἐφύρους· "τὼ μὲν ἄρ ἐκ Θρῄκης Ἐφύρους μέτα θωρήσεσθον." Ἔφυροι δὲ Φλεγῦαι βάρ-

βαρα ἔθνη. οἱ δὲ Ἐφύρους εἶναι τοὺς νῦν Ἀκαρνᾶνας λεγομένους, Φλεγυίας δὲ τοὺς πάλαι Γυρτώνην οἰκοῦντας.

ἐχάνδανεν ἐχώρει.

ἔχεαι συνέχῃ.

ἐχεπευκές ἔχον πικρίαν· πευκεθανὸν γὰρ τὸ ἔχον πικρίαν, ἀπὸ τῆς πεύκης.

ἔχῃ κατέχει.

ἔχματα κωλύματα, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπέχειν· "χερσὶ μάκελλαν ἔχων, ἀμάρης ἐξ ἔχματα βάλλων."

ἐχόμην ἐξειχόμην, κατεῖχον· "τῷ προσφύς εἰχόμην."

ἐχώμεθα ἀπεχώμεθα.

ἕψεαι ἀκολουθήσεις.

ἑψιαάσθων παιζέτωσαν.

ἔω ὦ, ὑπάρχω.

ἑῶμεν κορεσθῶμεν· "ἐπεί κ' ἑῶμεν πολέμοιο."

ζαής μεγαλόπνους. "ὡς δ' ἄνεμος ζαὴς νέφεα σκιόεντα."

ζάκοτος μεγαλόκοτος, μεγάλως ἐγκοτητικός.

ζατρεφέων μεγάλως τεθραμμένων.

ζαφλεγέες μεγάλως φλέγοντες.

ζαφελῶς ὁ μὲν Ἀπίων μεγαλοκότως. ἐπιφέρει δὲ τὸ μενεαίνειν, δι' οὗ σημαίνει τὸ ἐγκοτεῖν. ὅθεν κπεῖττον νοεῖν ἐκ τοῦ ζα καὶ τὸ ὀφέλλειν ἐπὶ τοῦ αὔξειν τίθεται. μεγάλως οὖν καὶ ηὐξημένως μενεαίνει καὶ χολοῦται.

ζαχρειῶν τῶν μεγάλως ἐπιζαρούντων, οἷον ἐμπνεόντων ἀθρόως.

Text of the Fragment.[1]

Col. 1.		Col. 2.
[ɛφɛπɛιν ɛπιπορɛϒ]	1	
[ɛcθαι τοccoϒc Δ ανθρωποϒc]	2	
[ɛφɛπɛιν και] πα(c)[ι μαχɛcθαι]	3	
[και αγρη]ν ɛφɛπ[ɛckον]	4	
[ɛφɛποντɛ]c ɛπ[ɛρχομ]	5	
P		
[ɛνοι ɛφ]θαcθ[ηc ɛνοηcαc]	6	
[ɛφϒροϒc] τω μ(ɛ)[ν αρ ɛκ θρηι]	7	
[κηc ɛφϒροϒ]c ο κομ[ψολογος]	8	
[ποιητης] δια το ϒ(π)[ɛναντιον]	9	
[ɛθη](κ)ɛ [το]ν αρη ɛ(ν)[θραικηι]	10	
[και] τα αλλα και ɛν [οδϒccɛιαι]	11	
[τω] Δ ɛπɛι ɛκ Δɛ[cμοιο λϒθ]	12	
[ɛν κ](ρα)τɛρον περ ɛον[τοc αϒ]	13	
[τικ ανα ιξα]ντɛc ο μɛ(ν) [θρηι]	14	
H		
[κηνΔɛ βɛ]βηκɛι θι Δ αρ[α κυπρ]	15	
[ον ικανɛ](ν) οι Δɛ ɛφϒροι [φλɛ]	16	
[γϒαι τɛ βαρ]βαρων ɛθνη ω[ν]	17	
[ο ποιητης] φηcιν [ɛ]φϒροϒ(c)	18	
[μɛν το]ϒc νϒν α[κανανα]c λɛ	19	
[γομɛνο]ϒc· φλ(ɛ)[γραc Δɛ τ]οϒc	20	ζαχ|ρειων των μεγαλως ɛ|
[παλαι γ]ϒρτων[ιοϒc και φη|cι	21	πιζαρο|ϒντων οιον cμπνɛ]
[ν ο ποιητ|ης οι Δ (α)[ργιccαν ɛχο|ν	22	ο|ντων| αθροως ζαχρειων
[και γϒ]ρτωνη(ν |ɛνɛμον|το	23	(μ)ων οι | τɛ νɛφɛα cκιοɛντ
[ɛχματα] κωλϒμα|τα απο| (τ)οϒ ɛ[7]	24	|και τα αλλα και ζαχρηιc τ

[1] Round brackets indicate letters which are indistinct or fragmentary, but which can be reasonably guessed at. Square brackets indicate letters entirely wanting or of which too little is left to form a basis for conjecture.

Col. 1.

[ΠΕΧΕΙΝ] ΧΕΡCΙ [ΜΑΚΕΛΛ]ΑΝ Ε>
[ΧΩΝ ΑΜ]ΑΡΗC Ε[Ζ ΕΧΜΑΤΑ] (Β)ΑΛΛΟΝ
[ΕΧΩΜΕΘΑ] ΑΠΕΧΩΜ[ΕΘ]Α ΕΝΘ ΑΥ
[ΤΟΙ Μ]ΕΝ ΕΧΩΜ[ε]
[ΕΧΕΠ]ΕΥΚΕC ΕΧΕΠΙΚΡΟΝ ΑΥΤΑΡ
[ΕΠΕ]ΙΤ ΑΥΤΟΙCΙ ΒΕΛΟC ΕΧΕΠΕΥ
[ΚΕC] ΕΦΙ(Ε)ΙC ΠΕΥΚΕΔΑΝΟΝ ΓΑΡ
[ΤΟ Π]ΙΚΡΟΝ ΑΠΟ ΤΗC ΠΕΥΚΗC
[ΕΧΕΠΙΚΡΟΝ] ΔΗΤΟΙ ΚΑΤΑ ΔΥΝΑΜΙΝ
[ΠΙΚΡΑΝ ΤΗ]Ν ΕΠΙ ΧΡ[ΩΙ Τ]ΩΝ⁷
[ΕΝ ΒΕΛ](ΕC)Ι ΦΑ[ΡΜΑΚΩΝ]

Col. 2.

25 ΜΕΓΑΛ(Η)[Ι ΔΥΝΑΜΕΙ ΧΡ]
26 [ΩΜ]ΕΝΩ[Ν ΩΔΕ ΓΑΡ ΕΒΡΙ]
27 [C]ΑΝ ΛΥΚΙ[ΩΝ ΑΓΟΙ ΟΙ ΤΟ ΠΑΡΟ
28 (Π)ΕΡ ΖΑ[ΧΡΗΕΙCΤΕΛΕΘΟΥCΙ ΚΑΤ
29 [ΚΡΑΤΕΡ]ΑC ΥC[ΜΙΝΑC]
30 [ΖΑ]ΦΕΛΩC [Ο ΜΕΝ ΑΠΙΩΝ ΜΕΓ
31 [ΛΟΚ]ΟΤΩ[C ΕΠΙΦΕΡΕΙ ΔΕ ΤΟ]
32 [ΜΕ]ΝΕ[ΑΙ](Ν)[ΕΙΝ ΔΙ ΟΥ]
33 [C] (?ΗΜΑ)[ΙΝΕΙ ΤΟ ΕΓΚΟΤΕΙΝ]
34
35

Textual Notes to Col. 1.

1–3. The restoration depends on ΠΑ(C) in 3, where Π may be ΤΙ and C may be Ε, or (less probably) Θ or Ο. If it be correct, *Il.* 20, 357 is quoted.

4. If the restoration be correct, *Od.* 12, 330 is quoted.

6. The first Θ is lined through and has Ρ written above it as a correction.

7. *Il.* 13, 301 is quoted.

9. Of the bracketed Π only Τ is visible. My restoration means 'for the sake of the contrast': see 15. I prefer -ΟΝ to -ΩΜΑ from considerations of space.

10. Only the last stroke of the (Κ) is visible.

11. [ΚΑΙ] ΤΑ ΑΛΛΑ ΚΑΙ. I believe it certain that the third word is not ΑΜΑ. 'Both elsewhere and especially'?

After ΕΝ can be seen the beginning of a curved letter.

12–16. *Od.* 8, 360–62 are quoted. In 14 note ΑΝΑΙΞΑΝΤΕC, not the unmetrical *ἀναΐξαντε*. In 15 ΟΙ is lined through, and Η written above. In 16 only the top of the last stroke of the (Ν) is visible.

22–3. *Il.* 2, 738 is quoted.

25. *Il.* 21, 259 is quoted.

27–8. *Il.* 14, 129 is quoted (*ἔνθαδ' ἔπειτ' αὐτοὶ μὲν ἐχώμεθα*).

29–31. *Il.* 1, 51 is quoted.

33. I am not satisfied with the restoration. In 33 remnants of a few strokes are consistent with ΡΟΝ, and in 34 part of the second Ω is visible. In 35 I should have restored ΕΠΙ (not ΕΝ) but for its occurrence in the previous line.

Textual Notes to Col. 2.

1–19. The words explained may have been *ἐχάνδανεν, ἔχεαι, ἔχῃ, ἐχόμην, ἔψεαι, ἐψιαάσθων, ἔω, ἐῶμεν, ζαής, ζάκοτος, ζατρεφέων, ζαφλεγέες*.

22–3. *Il.* 5, 525 is quoted.

24. [ΚΑΙ ΤΑ ΑΛΛΑ ΚΑΙ]. There are remains of a few strokes which suggested this restoration. 'Both elsewhere and especially'?

26–9. *Il.* 12, 346–7 or 359–60 are quoted.

33. The queried letters are very doubtful, and the Η might be Π. What I take to be the first stroke of the first Ν is visible.

Palaeographical Notes.

The fragment is written on one side only, and is consequently part of a roll, not of a papyrus in book form. It contains parts of two columns, without any juncture between them—but affords no evidence as to whether more than two columns were written on each sheet. Line 35 of col. 1 is the last line of a column, but there is no evidence whether or not line 3 had lines above it: we only know that this column contained *at least* thirty-three lines. The lines of col. 2 are not usually on a level with those of col. 1. Spaces are occasionally left between words, and in col. 1, line 28 half a line is left blank between two explanations. Corrections are made by drawing a line through the middle

of the wrong letters and putting the right ones above them. The only marks of punctuation, etc. are as follows: col. 1, line 20 ˙ as a minor stop (? *ὑποδιαστολή*); col. 1, line 24 7, apparently to fill up the line; col. 1, line 25 ≻, apparently to mark a *ἅπαξ εἰρημένον*; col. 1, line 34 the same sign as in line 24 but slightly rounded. There is one instance of abbreviation: ЄXѠΛЄΘⲁ, when repeated in a quotation, is written ЄXѠΛᵋ (col. 1, line 28). The Z at the beginning of col. 2, line 20, is much larger than in other parts of the fragment, and projects markedly into the space between the columns. As regards the shapes of letters, the most noticeable is that of *a*, which is never A but always rounded (*e.g.* ⲁ) and sometimes looped at the top. In col. 1, line 31, (Є)I are ligatured, the Є being above the line.

More than a year ago I sent to most of the chief libraries in the world a collotype facsimile of the fragment. In defence of my own transcript it must, however, be said that the collotypes are not everywhere as clear as the original, and that they even differ occasionally among themselves in the legibility with which some of the strokes are brought out.

Literary Conclusions.

The chief literary conclusions to be drawn from the fragment are as follows:—

(1) The original Apollonius followed the order of the alphabet only as regards the first two letters of each word. Thus ЄXЄΠЄΥKЄC comes after ЄXѠΛЄΘⲁ.[1]

(2) The printed text is largely abbreviated. Apparently *ἐφέπειν* and an accompanying quotation have been omitted. Under Ἐφύρους, the discursion on Ares and Thrace, with its accompanying quotation, is left out, as is the quotation referring to the Gyrtonians. Under *ἐχώμεθα* a quotation is omitted, and so under *ἐχεπευκές*, the latter article being apparently further shortened. Under *ζαχρειῶν* a quotation is omitted, together with the comparison of *ζαχρηεῖς* and a further quotation.

(3) The abbreviation is effected partly by simple omission, partly by a kind of conflation. Thus ΓΥΡΤѠNIOΥC, followed by a quotation containing ΓΥΡΤѠNΗN, has been conflated into *Γυρτώνην οἰκοῦντας*. The articles *ἐφέπεσκον* and *ἐφέποντες* appear to afford other examples.

(4) The fragment does not *prove* that its text contained the quotations from Apion found in the printed edition, but col. 2, lines 30–32 furnish an overwhelming probability that it did contain them.

The bearings of (4) on the disputed date of Apollonius are as obvious to every one else as to myself. In the Sutherland village from which (with the help of transcripts and notes made at Oxford) this article is written, I have not the materials for discussing that question—not even a copy of Apollonius.

E. W. B. Nicholson.

[1] Hence it wouldn't do to infer that the original Apollonius didn't contain under Єϕ the words from *ἐφετμή* to *ἐφόλκαιον* or under ЄX the words *ἐχάνδανεν, ἔχεαι, ἔχῃ, ἐχόμην*: our fragment doesn't give the beginning of Єϕ or the end of ЄX.

ἀμφότεροι IN LATER GREEK.

In a note on the *De cerimoniis* of Constantine Porphyrogennetos (ed. Bonn, ii. p. 500) Reiske has attempted to establish that *ἀμφότεροι* is used by later Greek writers as equivalent to *πάντες*. The instances which he brings forward, and some others of the same kind, deserve examination.

Theophanes, 238, 9 ed. de Boor (368 Bonn): Σέργιός τε ὁ Αἰθερίου ἀνεψιός, διαδρὰς προσέφυγεν ἐν Βλαχέρναις, ὃν...ἔπεισαν ὁμολογῆσαι, ὡς καὶ Ἰσάκιος ὁ ἀργυροπράτης καὶ Βελισάριος...συνῄδει τῇ τοιαύτῃ ἐπιβουλῇ, καὶ Βῖτος ὁ ἀργυροπράτης καὶ Παῦλος ὁ κουράτωρ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Βελισαρίου ἐγίνωσκον τὴν σκέψιν. καὶ συσχεθέντων ἀμφοτέρων...κατέθεντο καὶ κατεῖπον Βελισαρίου. This is taken from Malalas (p. 494 ed. Bonn.); the Barocciianus omits the words *ἐγίνωσκον τὴν σκέψιν*, which Theophanes preserves. In the MSS. of Theophanes there are variants *πάντων* and *πάντων ἀμφοτέρων* for *ἀμφοτέρων*; but *ἀμφοτέρων* is supported by the agreement of the Baroccianus. It obviously bears its ordinary sense; the persons arrested were Vitus and Paulus; there is not the least need to suppose that Isaac was included.

Theophanes, 465, 15 ed. de Boor (720 Bonn): *ἡ βασίλισσα ἐσώρευσε καὶ αὐτὴ πάντα τὰ Ῥωμαικὰ πλοῖματα καὶ ἀπέλυσε κατ' αὐτῶν. ἐλθόντος δὲ ἕως Τὰ Μύρα ἀμφότεροι οἱ στρατηγοὶ κ.τ.λ.* This passage is not alleged by Reiske, but it is rather important. For if at this time A.D. 789–90 the three naval themes which we find existing at a later period were already established, we should have here a clear case of *ἀμφότεροι* referring to three persons,—since *all* the naval forces were called out. Now, while we meet the Cibyraeot theme and the Aegean theme in the eighth century, we have not, so far as I am aware, any mention of the theme of Samos previous to this year. M. Charles Diehl has demonstrated in his recent study on the origin of the Themes,[1] that originally (in the seventh and first half of the eighth centuries) there was only one naval theme (named *τὸ θέμα τῶν πλωιζομένων* or *τῶν Καραβισιάνων*, cp. Const. Porph. iii. p. 41, and Lib. Pont. p. 390 ed. Duchesne). It had subordinate divisions, one of which was that of the Cibyraeots. In A.D. 781 we hear of a drungarios of the Dodekanesos (= the Aegean), and one of the Lives of Theophanes mentions that his father was a commander of this theme (p. 28 ed. de Boor). From these passages we may infer that probably before A.D. 781 and certainly before A.D. 790, the single naval theme had been divided into two, but not yet into three, smaller themes.

Theophanes, p. 471, ed. de Boor (730 Bonn). Constantine VI. marches against the Saracens, *ἔχων...ἐκλογὴν μονοζώνων στρατιωτῶν ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων θεμάτων χιλιάδας κ'.* In interpreting this passage we must remember the strict use of *ἀμφότεροι*, which ought properly to apply not to two individual persons or things, but to two collective groups (like *ἑκάτεροι* and *ἕκαστοι*). It thus corresponded to the German *beiderlei*. Cp. *e.g.* Hes. *Sc.* 177 *ἀμφότεροι χλοῦναί τε σύες χαροποί τε λέοντες.* Now the themes fell naturally into two groups, the European and the Asiatic (cp. Constantine's division in his *περὶ θεμάτων*); and this explains *ἀμφοτέρων* here.

Theophanes p. 469 ed. de Boor (p. 725 Bonn): *ἐβούλευσαντο ἐξαγαγεῖν Νικηφόρον τὸν ἀπὸ καισάρων καὶ στῆσαι εἰς βασιλέα. τοῦτο γνοὺς Κωνσταντῖνος ἀποστείλας ἐξήγαγεν ἀμφοτέρους τοὺς υἱοὺς Κωνσταντίνου...καὶ τὸν μὲν Νικηφόρον ἐτύφλωσεν, Χριστοφόρον δὲ καὶ Νικήταν, Ἀνθιμόν τε καὶ Εὐδόκιμον ἐγλωσσοκόπησεν.* Here is a case which seems at first sight to tell more in favour of Reiske, though he does not cite it. But it is really another case of two groups: Nicephorus, and his brothers. Nicephorus is opposed to the rest; he is the most dangerous, he undergoes the severest punishment. *ἀμφοτέρους* might be translated 'all,' but it connotes a distinct suggestion of two groups.

Theophanes p. 184 ed. de Boor (284 Bonn): *τὴν μεγάλην ἐκκλησίαν σὺν τοῖς ἀμφοτέροις κίοσιν· καὶ πᾶσα ἐκ τετραέντου κατηνέχθη.* Referring to the Paschal Chronicler, who used the same sources as Theophanes in this passage we find *ἡ μεγάλη ἐκκλησία πᾶσα σὺν τοῖς φοβεροῖς καὶ θαυμαστοῖς κίοσι πᾶσα ἐκ τετραέντου κατηνέχθη.* One's first thought might be to substitute *φοβεροῖς* for *ἀμφοτέροις* in Theophanes. But a moment's reflexion convinces one that *φοβεροῖς* is really suspicious. I question seriously whether *φοβερός* would have been used to describe the pillars; it would be a very unsuitable epithet for the pillars of any fourth or fifth century basilica we know. *οἱ ἀμφότεροι κίονες* means 'the two sets or rows of pillars,' that is, the pillars on either side of the nave; and I have very little doubt that *σὺν τοῖς ἀμφοτέροις θαυμαστοῖς κίοσιν* should be restored in the Paschal Chronicle.

Theophanes p. 111, 17 ed. de Boor (172 Bonn). It is obvious that some words (proper names) have fallen out in this passage, and Reiske's attempt to explain *ἀμφοτέρους* by *πάντας* need not be seriously considered unless this meaning had been otherwise fully established for *ἀμφότεροι*. 'Equidem mutilum esse locum statuo,' de Boor.

Theoph. Contin., p. 467 ed. Bonn. *καὶ δὴ τὴν κλίνην αὐτοῦ ἀμφοτέρων περικυκλούντων.* This is equivalent to 'on both sides' of the bed, *ἀμφοτέρωθεν*.

Constantine Porph., De Cer., p. 81, l. 19 ed. Bonn. *ὁ δὲ πρωτοστράτωρ καὶ ὁ κόμης τοῦ στάβλου ἔνθεν κἀκεῖσε τοῦ βασιλέως, οἱ δὲ στράτορες πέριξ, ἀμφότεροι δὲ αὐτῶν πεζοί.* This case is similar to the last. *ἀμφότεροι* is explained by the preceding *ἔνθεν κἀκεῖσε* and means those *on both sides* of the Emperor. *ἀμφότεροι* has the same meaning in the ceremonies described on p. 312, where it occurs three times (ll. 2, 4, 13), and refers to two symmetrical groups (apparently of Blues and Greens). So again p. 313, ll. 5, 13, 16.

Ib. p. 648. 16. *ἀμφότεροι* has its common sense of both (two brothers of Basil) and I

[1] L'origine du régime des thèmes dans l'empire byzantin, in the Études d'histoire du moyen âge dediées à Gabriel Monod. 1896.

cannot imagine why Reiske refers to this passage.

Ib. p. 656, ll. 12, 16, 18. Here we have a peculiar use of *ἀμφότερα* which goes nearer to justify Reiske's thesis than any other case he cites. The passage contains a calculation of the naval and military budget. (1) Four items are given: $(3 \times 36 =) 108 + (12 \times 42 =) 504 + (6 \times 42 =) 252 + (4 \times 5000 =) 20000$ *nomismata*. The sum of these four items is thus stated: *γινόμενα ἀμφότερα κεντηνάρια β′, λίτραι ϙ′ θ′, : νς′.* [By the way, the addition is wrong. For the total of nomismata is 20864, and $\frac{20864}{72} = 289\frac{56}{72}$ (not $299\frac{56}{72}$)]. (2) Another four items are given, and the same formula *γινόμενα ἀμφότερα* is used. (3) To these two totals: 2 cent. 99 litr. 56 nom. + 55 litr. 7 nom., two other items are added, 83 litr. 24 nom. and 13 litr. 64 nom.; and the sum is then given: *καὶ ὁμοῦ διὰ τοῦ ἀμφοτέρου προχρέου ρρ δ′ λίτραι νβ′ : ξ (legendum ζ′).* [This total, 4 cent. 52 litr. 7 nom., proves that the error in the first total was a slip of the brain and not a mere slip of the pen.]

From this passage we see that *ἀμφότερα* was used in arithmetical addition in the sense of *together* (*zusammen*), or *total*. But this usage must be explicable from the proper use of *ἀμφότεροι(-α)*. And it seems to cast some light on the obscure question: How did the ordinary Greek, when he had no abacus to help him, find the sum of a number of items? We may suppose that sums in addition practically resolved themselves into a series of sums of two numbers. Greek children were taught to add three numbers together by first adding two, and then adding the third to the sum of these; and the practice would naturally be retained by the inexpert. Thus the addition of five numbers was equivalent to:—

$$\{[(a+b)+c]+d\}+e,$$

and, the ultimate operation being the addition of two numbers, the phrase *ἀμφότερα γινόμενα* was correct. Of course I do not mean to say that people who were in the habit of dealing with numerical sums employed this primitive process; the existence of the colloquial phrase *ἀμφότερα γινόμενα* is explained, if we admit that such a process was used at all in teaching children or otherwise.[1]

In the same connexion Reiske observes that Theophanes uses *ἑκάτεροι* for *πάντες*, in speaking of three crosses: *ἑκατέρων τῶν σταυρῶν.* But the true reading *ἑκάτερον* is preserved by a Vatican MS. and restored by de Boor (p. 26, l. 12). *A Graeculo nihil non exspectes*, adds Reiske contemptuously; *caelum terra miscent.* In the Thesaurus of Stephanus (*sub voce ἀμφότερα*) Reiske's dictum is accepted. A closer examination has shown that it can be accepted only in a form so modified that the sneer at the Graeculus loses its point.[2]

In those passages quoted by Reiske, where *ἀμφότεροι* refers to more than two, there is always implied a twofold grouping. In the numerical usage of *ἀμφότερα*, the duplicity which was originally implied has almost ceased to be evident. We next reach a stage in which the idea of duplicity is entirely lost, and *ἀμφότεροι*, as Reiske says—though he gives no true instance—is equivalent to *πάντες*. We have true instances in the tenth-century poem, *Digenês Akritas*; ii. 244 (Cod. Cryptoferr., ed. Legrand) *καὶ ἀμφότεροι παρευθὺς εἰς τὸν γαμβρὸν εἰσῆλθον*, where *five* persons are referred to, without any implication of two groups. In iv. 213 *ἀμφότεροι may* refer only to Digenes and his father, but it *may* also include his uncle. In i. 205 *ἀμφότεροι* is equivalent to *πάντες*, but might be (unconsciously) conditioned by the two groups of the preceding line (*οἱ μὲν φιλοῦσι χεῖράς τοῦ, ἄλλοι τὴν κεφαλήν του*). In ii. 28, if the MS. of Grotta-Ferrata were right, *ἄμφω* would have to be explained in the sense of *πάντες*, but the MSS. of Trebizond and Andros save us from the necessity of this assumption by their reading *ἅμα*.

J. B. Bury.

[1] It is obvious that it was much harder for a Greek than for a modern child to learn to add. The Greeks had no sign for zero, and they had 27 instead of 9 (10 including zero) symbols. The difficulty can easily be tested by experiment.

[2] It is unnecessary to discuss Reiske's reference to a passage in Demosthenes' speech in reply to Callippus, where *ἀμφοτέρας* has its ordinary meaning (§ 19). He also gives a reference to Eusebius which I have failed to identify.

HESIODEA.

Hesiod is read in the Flach-Göttling edition of 1878, a useful Variorum giving abundant material collected conveniently for the reader; the editor, however, lacked judgment, and was at the mercy of any dissertation-writer, at whose bidding he would alter or cut out without reflection and without mercy. Many of these disfigurements were removed by Alois Rzach, whose edition of 1884 is at once the latest and the most satisfactory. The learned author, whose labours upon Hesiod date from more than twenty years back, promises a large edition based on a complete collation of the MSS. (see his account of these in the last number of the *Wiener Studien.*) It will be exceedingly welcome to all students of early Greek epos.

I collect here some brief suggestions upon variants or interpretations that have occurred to me during a reading of the Hesiodic poems.

Theog. 532. *ταῦτ' ἄρα ἀζόμενος τίμα ἀριδείκετον υἱόν.*

The hiatus is quite justified by *h. Dem.* 78 *δὴ γὰρ μέγα ἄζομαι*, but if any conjecture is wanted it is certainly not Robinson's impossible *τοῦτον ἄρ'*, which Flach prints; Rzach's *ταῦτά γ' ἄρ'* also is not very attractive; perhaps *ταύτῃ ἄρ' ἀζόμενος τιμῇ*, but the vulgate is quite sound.

703. *ὡς ὅτε γαῖα καὶ οὐρανὸς εὐρὺς ὕπερθεν πίλνατο.*

It looked and sounded 'like as when earth and heaven meet;' true, indeed, that they never have met, and therefore logically *ὡς εἰ* and not *ὡς ὅτε* is required. However *ὅτε* is certain, and the boldness of expression may be put to the credit of the poet; *πίλναιν θ'*, which Hermann, Schoemann, Flach, and Rzach read, does not really facilitate *ὅτε*, and if original could hardly have come down to *πίλνατο*, much the harder reading.

706. *σὺν δ' ἄνεμοι ἔνοσίν τε κονίην τ' ἐσφαράγιζον* 'M,' etc., *κόνιν τ' ἐσφαράγιζον* 'VOC,' *κόνιν θ' ἅμα ἐσφαράγιζον* 'E.' Rzach applauds and accepts the conjecture of Stadtmüller *κόνιν τ' ἄμυδις σφαράγιζον*, but surely this is to fly in the teeth of the evidence. The oldest and best MSS. give *κονίην τ' ἐσφαράγιζον*, a perfectly satisfactory reading. In several MSS. the eta fell out of *κονίην* and gave *κόνιν*, producing thereby destruction of metre; to remedy this one MS. introduced *ἅμα*; are we to start from this palpable conjecture and work it into a fully equipped verse?

783. *καί ῥ' ὅς τις ψεύδηται ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἐχόντων*
Ζεὺς δέ τε Ἶριν ἔπεμψε.....

I am puzzled to guess why the two latest editors have taken offence at *ὅς τις*; 'whatever immortal tells a lie, Zeus sends Iris' ...Is it regard for the Olympians that made Gerhard and Scheer conjecture *ὅτε τις*? surely on any ground a most otiose alteration. The concrete, not the hypothetical, pleases poets, as with *πίλνατο* above; and here at least there is no improbability in the assumption.

Scut. 54. *αὐτὰρ Ἰφικλῆα δορυσσόῳ (λαοσσόῳ* some MSS.) *Ἀμφιτρύωνι.*

Whatever may be necessary to set this line at rest, surely we can do without Rzach's impossible *τὸν δ' ἄρα* for *αὐτάρ*. The digamma in *Ἰφικλῆα* will amply lengthen the second syllable of *αὐτάρ*, and be *λαοσσόῳ* a gloss or not, we need not have recourse to it.

132. [*οἱστοὶ*] *πρόσθεν μὲν θάνατόν τ' εἶχον καὶ δακρύσι μῦρον.*

The second explanation of the scholiast is obviously right, *ὡς κεχρισμένων τῶν βελῶν ὄντων θανασίμῳ φαρμάκῳ*, and not the first which Flach-Göttling, preferring, render *ciebant lacrimas occisorum cognatorum!*

211. *δοιοὶ δ' ἀναφυσιόωντες*
ἀργύρεοι δελφῖνες ἐφοίτων ἔλλοπας ἰχθῦς.

No ex. of *φοιτᾶν* with the simple acc. can be quoted, and we may well wonder that both the editors give the line thus. Unless by any expedient a preposition can be introduced into the line, there is no course but to accept *ἐθοίνων*, the reading of two or three MSS., from which *ἐφοίτων* will have come by the frequent change of *φ* to *θ*:—*ἐθοίτων ἐφοίνων ἐφοίτων.*

252. *ὃν δὲ πρῶτον μεμάποιεν*
κείμενον ἢ πίπτοντα νεούτατον, ἀμφὶ μὲν αὐτῷ
βάλλ' ὄνυχας μεγάλους—

It is impossible to accept the change from plural to singular involved in *βάλλ'*, particularly as the plural continues immediately in *ῥίπτασκον* 256, *ἐθύνεον αὗτις ἰοῦσαι* 257. Deiter's *γε μεμάποι* for *μεμάποιεν* is justly rejected by Rzach. Perhaps *βάλλ'* has a middle sense and the subject is *ὅν*; we must then write *αὐτῷ*, 'Whomever they caught or wounded, he got their great claws round his body while his soul fled to Tartarus.'

288. *οἵγε μὲν ἤμων*
αἰχμῇς ὀξείῃσι κορυνιόωντα πέτηλα.

How mowing can be done with spears has naturally torn the commentators; Paley substituted *ἄρπῃς* for *αἰχμῇς*. The dative however is not instrumental but of accompaniment, 'the ears bristling with sharp spears,' viz., the blades or stalks, a metaphor in keeping with the elaborate style of this interesting poem. Burns says (Elegy on Capt. Matthew Henderson)

> Mourn, spring, thou darling of the year!
> Ilk cowslip cup shall kep a tear:
> Thou, simmer, while each corny spear
> Shoots up its head;

and people better acquainted than I with modern verse can doubtless produce other parallels. Ancient literature does not seem to know the metaphor, unless it underlies the line *Eumenides* 805: Athena says

μὴ θυμοῦσθε, μηδ' ἀκαρπίαν
τεύξητ' ἀφεῖσαι δαιμόνων σταλάγματα,

and these drops are then described as *βρωτῆρας αἰχμὰς σπερμάτων ἀνημέρους*, in the sense given by the scholiast, *τὰ σταλάγματα αἰχμαὶ εἰσι βιβρώσκουσαι τὰ σπέρματα*. The expression seems unbearably harsh: if we read the genitive *αἰχμᾶς*, *i.e.* *αἰχμῆς*, and render 'unkind devourers of the seeds of the blade," all goes well.

293. *sq.* The repetition of *οἱ δ' αὖτ' ἐς ταλάρους ἐφόρευν* 293 and 296. A double recension is usually supposed, and certainly the recurrence at so short an interval is curious. Still the theory of two recensions that have coalesced is not legitimate unless the context as it stands is unintelligible, and this is not the case here if the dative which a minority of MSS. offer at both 293 and 296 be accepted (preferably at 296). One set of labourers bring the grapes *ἐς ταλάρους*, another carry the grapes *ἐν ταλάροις* away, *i.e.* to the tubs; cf. 482 *οἴσεις δ' ἐν φορμῷ*. The effect of the homoearchon will have been reciprocal but the accusative had the upper hand. Read therefore

οἱ δ' αὖτ' ἐς ταλάρους ἐφόρευν ὑπὸ τρυγητήρων
λευκοὺς καὶ μέλανας βότρυας μεγάλων ἀπὸ
ὄρχων,
βριθομένων φύλλοισι καὶ ἀργυρέῃς ἐλίκεσσιν,
οἱ δ' αὖτ' ἐν ταλάροις ἐφόρευν.

Opp. 33. *τοῦ κε κορεσσάμενος νείκεα καὶ δῆριν*
ὀφέλλοις
κτήμασ' ἐπ' ἀλλοτρίοις· σοὶ δ' οὐκέτι
δεύτερον ἔσται
ὧδ' ἐρδειν.

I am surprised that Rzach follows Schoemann, Steitz and Flach in writing *ὀφέλλοι* for *ὀφέλλοις*. It is an almost trivial objection to say that Perses is distinguished from those who can indulge in quarrels. The reference is to Perses throughout. 'Be not litigious, for short is the season of strife and suits except to him that hath abundant livelihood laid up. If thou wert full of that, mightest thou increase strife for other men's goods; but for *thee* (*sc.* a poor man like you) there will be no second chance of doing so.' *Κορεσσάμενος* of course is strongly hypothetical, *σοὶ δὲ* is the fact, 'you as you are.' *Ὀφέλλοι* had it stood in the MSS. would have suited, but there is no necessity to put it in. Further, I may notice that no gap is necessary between 32 and 33; the sense continues without a break.

372. *πίστεις δ' ἄρα ὁμῶς. Γάρ τοι, δ' ἄρ τοι, ἄρ τοι* (Rzach) are proposed, but *τοι* is brought in unnecessarily if *εἰς εὐνὴν ἀνέσαιμι ὁμωθῆναι* may stand Ξ 209. Why not *γάρ ῥα*?

455. *φησὶ δ' ἀνὴρ φρένας ἀφνειὸς πήξασθαι*
ἄμαξαν,
νήπιος· οὐδὲ τόγ' οἶδ'.

ἀφνειὸς is universally taken to = 'rich,' but *φρένας ἀφνειὸς* 'animo dives' if it can have a meaning must plainly be complimentary, while the sense required is more in the direction of *νήπιος*, a blame of some sort. I venture to suggest that *ἀφνειός* has nothing to do with the ordinary word of the same letters, but means 'hasty, thoughtless,' and is connected with *ἄφνω*, *αἴφνης*, etc. 'I said *in my haste*...' I trust etymologists will give this proposal lenient treatment.

464. *νειὸς ἀλεξιάρη παίδων εὐκηλήτειρα.*

This is a question of interpretation. Göttling in his note wishes to weaken the statement into a mere expression of prosperity. 'Ploughland makes happy faces'; but no one will agree with him, and Lehrs saw that some specific belief was implied. It is a matter for the folklorists, who we may hope may be able to establish the connection between newly-ploughed land and soothing children. Two other passages that require light at their hands are 750 *μηδ' ἐπ' ἀκινήτοισι καθίζειν οὐ γὰρ ἄμεινον | παῖδα δυωδεκαταῖον, ὅτ' ἀνέρ' ἀνήνορα ποιεῖ | μηδὲ δυωδεκάμηνον. ἴσον καὶ τοῦτο τέτυκται*, and the mysterious lines *h. Dem.* 228 *sq.* (for which I suggested a meaning, *Classical Review*, 1895, p. 13).

467. *ὅτ' ἂν ἄκρον ἐχέτλης*
χειρὶ λαβὼν ὄρπηκα βοῶν ἐπὶ νῶτον ἴκηαι.

Flach and Rzach have doubtless done well in ejecting the dative *ὄρπηκι* which Brunck introduced to ease the construction, but the connection remains extremely difficult. Flach joins *ὄρπηκα ἐχέτλης*—surely impossible. There is a glut of accusatives, each of which is so well in place that it is hard to make any one give room to another. As the words stand we must make *χειρὶ—νῶτον* parenthetical, and *βοῶν ἐπὶ νῶτον* epexegetical of *ὄρπηκα*. The position is similar to that enjoined on Antilochus, Ψ 581 *sq.* 'Αν' *ἄκρον* is possible.

480. *ἤμενος ἀμήσεις ὀλίγον περὶ χειρὸς ἐέργων,*
ἀντία δεσμεύων κεκονιμένος, οὐ μάλα χαίρων,
οἴσεις δ' ἐν φορμῷ·

ἀντία is hard. Without a gen. it should mean 'opposite,' as h. *Herm.* 77 *ἀντία ποιήσας ὅπλας τὰς πρόσθεν ὄπισθεν*; but even if it could mean 'straight on,' how does this go with *δεσμεύων*? which moreover has its epithet in *κεκονιμένος*. An accusative would seem wanted, and I ask whether *ἀντία* may not be this accusative. *ἀντίον* we are told by the Lexx. means 'part of a loom,' Ar. *Thesm.* 822; but considering the uses of the Latin antes antae, may it not have had a wider sense and meant (as here) 'rows'? 'Binding up the rows (sc. of fallen ears), dusty, not happy' gives a clear sense. It would be another way of saying *δράγματα* (C 552).

531. *καὶ πᾶσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ τοῦτο μέμηλεν,*
οἳ σκέπα μαιόμενοι πυκινοὺς κευθμῶνας ἔχουσι.

Rzach strangely accepts Peppmüller's violent *ὡς σκέπα—ἔχωσι*. Criticism would be an easy occupation if *ὡς* could be written for *οἳ*, and *vice versa*, wherever the sense seemed to demand it. The interpretations also (*οἳ* = *ἐκεῖσε* Hermann, = *ἑαυτοῖς* Brugmann) improve the writer, not the scribe. With Paley and Göttling the relative suffices: *τοῦτο, sc. τὸ φεύγειν, μέμηλε πᾶσι τοῖς κευθμῶνας ἔχουσι.*

765. *ἤματα δ' ἐκ Διόθεν πεφυλαγμένος εὖ κατὰ μοῖραν*
πεφραδέμεν δμώεσσι τριηκάδα μηνὸς ἀρίστην
ἔργα τ' ἐποπτεύειν ἠδ' ἁρμαλιὴν δατέασθαι,
εὖτ' ἂν ἀληθείην λαοὶ κρίνοντες ἄγωσι.
αἳ δὲ γὰρ ἡμέραι εἰσὶ Διὸς πάρα μητιόεντος·
770. *πρῶτον ἔνη τετράς τε κ.τ.λ.*

The transposition of 768 after 769, recommended by Schoemann and adopted by Rzach, not only fails to assist 768 itself, but makes nonsense of the calendar that follows 769. The line can only mean 'when the people keep truth in judgment,' the day of the month when solemn justice is administered. Hesiod says this day, the 30th is suitable for the analogous duties of inspecting work and dividing rations. 769 begins a new calendar of days suitable one for one occupation, one for another; to say of *all* of them that they are the days 'when the people keep truth in judgment' is obvious nonsense. The courts did not sit at haphazard through the month, nor probably was 'truth observed' as often.

THOMAS W. ALLEN.

ON SOME PASSAGES IN JUVENAL *SATIRES* I., AND III.

I. 64–58.

cum iam sexta ceruice feratur
hinc atque inde patens ac nuda paene cathedra
et multum referens de Maecenate supino
signator falsi, qui se lautum atque beatum
exiguis tabulis et gemma fecerit uda.

67 falsi P (*apparently*) falso p ω.

Here *signator falsi* means 'the signatory to a forgery.' Dig. xlviii. 10, 1, § 4 *qui in rationibus tabulis cerisue uel alia qua re sine consignatione falsum fecerint* ('have committed forgery') etc. Id. 12 *falsi reus.* 13 *falsi nominis uel cognominis adseueratio poena falsi coercetur. ordine decurionum decem annis aduocatum motum, qui falsum instrumentum cognoscente praetore recitauit, post finem temporis dignitatem respondi reciperare, quoniam in Corneliam falso recitato, non facto non incidit.* Suet. Aug. 33 *cum de falso testamento ageretur, omnesque signatores lege Cornelia tenerentur.* Roman wills were signed by five witnesses in the presence of a *libripens* (Dict. A. ii. 803): they were usually kept in temples: the forger in question probably abstracted the genuine will, and forged a new one in his own favour, together with the seals of the witnesses. *Signator* accordingly means 'the maker of *signa*.' Such a forgery was performed by Oppianicus Cic. Cluent. § 41 *eadem hac Dinea testamentum faciente, cum tabulas prehendisset Oppianicus, qui gener eius fuisset, digito legata deleuit et cum id multis locis fecisset, post mortem eius ne lituris coargui posset, testamentum in alias tabulas transcriptum signis adulterinis obsignauit.* The will which was signed by the five witnesses, was written on tablets tied with strings, and sealed on the outside with the seals of the witnesses (*gemma uda*). *Signator* is regular for a witness to a will: x. 336 *ueniet cum signatoribus auspex.*

The reading *signator falso* must be rejected. It cannot be explained as 'the signatory to a forgery' ('*signator falso* intellige *testamento*, qui obsignauit suppositicium testamentum, signator in falsis tabulis' —Gronovius Obseru. ii. 24); Latinity would require the genitive, as in the text, not dative: nor can it be equivalent to *signator falso* (*signo*) (Heinrich), as the ellipsis of *signo* is hard to parallel. Therefore, if it were retained, it would be necessary to punctuate *signator, falso qui* etc. (Ruperti, Mayor), 'the signatory, who by forgery, those tiny tablets and the moistened signet, has made himself prosperous and wealthy:' then *exiguis tabulis* and *gemma uda* would be a further explanation of *falso*. But the ambiguity inherent in the interpretation of this reading condemns it, apart from any external reason. The conjectures *signato falso* (Madvig) *signator falsus* (Ruperti) hardly deserve notice; though Sall. Cat. 16 § 2 *ex illis testis signatoresque falsos commodare* shows the latter to be possible.

I. 105.

sed quinque tabernae
quadringenta parant.

Here *quinque tabernae* seems to mean 'five shops' which are managed for the affluent *libertinus* by *institores*, and bring him in an income of H.S. 400,000 (£3,400), the assessment of an *eques* (v. 132). Trade at Rome was chiefly in the hands of freedmen. As the profit on these five shops has seemed to some persons large, it has been supposed that the *quinque tabernae* are the five banks in the Forum mentioned by Livy xxvi. 27, 2 *eodem tempore* (B.C. 210) *septem tabernae, quae postea quinque, et argentariae, quae nunc nouae appellantur, arsere.* The meaning would then be 'my dealings on 'Change produce me a knight's fee.' But these *tabernae* in Juvenal's time had ceased to exist, and their site was occupied by the Basilica Iulia (Middleton, Ancient Rome, i. 233): hence this hypothesis must be dismissed. As we have no means of knowing how much business this freedman's five shops did, it is idle to criticise the amount of the profits. It is even possible that the *tabernae* in question were private banks, in which case the profits might have been very great. Further, though this freedman is no doubt boasting, there is nothing irreconcilable or absurd in his naming the sum *quadringenta*, and proceeding to add *ego possideo plus Pallante et Licinis* (108): for though Pallas was worth about two-and-a-half million sterling (Tac. A. xii. 53, 5), that was not his annual income. This freedman may well have had other sources of income besides the *quinque tabernae;* as indeed is indicated by the word *possideo*, which means 'I am holder (*possessor*) of more real property.' Cp. iii. 141 *quot possidet agri*

iumenta? x. 225 *quot uillas possideat nunc.* xii. 129 *possideat quantum rapuit Nero.* xiv. 159 *si tantum culti solus possederis agri.*

Friedländer may be right in understanding *quinque* as a round number 'five shops or so': see his note on xi. 206 *facere hoc non possis quinque diebus.*

I. 142–146.

poena tamen praesens, cum tu deponis amictus
turgidus, et crudus pauonem in balnea portas.
hinc subitae mortes atque intestata senectus
et noua nec tristis per cunctas fabula cenas:
ducitur iratis plaudendum funus amicis.

143 crudus P *and Paris.* 9345 *saec.* xi., *published by Hosius.* crudum *p* ω.

The reading *crudus* is unwisely rejected by all editors in favour of *crudum*, which, besides appearing in the inferior MSS., is found also in Phocas G.L.K. 24 *dicuntur et haec balnea . . . Iuuenalis 'et crudum pauonem in balnea portas.'* Schol. Pers. iii. 98 Jahn. *turgidum dicit crudum, indigestum, ut Iuuenalis 'turgidus et crudum pauonem in balnea portas.'* Cornutus Schol. (Höhler, p. 392) *crudum. indigestum incoctum.* gloss. Pith. (Lommatzsch, p. 396) *crudum: nondum confectum indigestum.*

As regards external evidence, the testimony of P outweighs all inferior authorities; whether interpolated MSS., or grammarians, whose quotations are notoriously inaccurate, or scholia and glosses, which are generally valueless: moreover I believe that the words *turgidus et crudus* are a reminiscence of Hor. epp. i. 6, 61 *crudi tumidique lauemur.* As regards internal evidence, Latin usage requires *crudus*, which means 'suffering from indigestion' as in vi. 203 *mustacea crudis donanda.* Cato R. R. 125 *cruda aluus.* Hor. sat. i. 5, 49 *namque pila lippis inimicum et ludere crudis.* Cic. Clu. § 168 *cum ad illud prandium crudior uenisset.* de or. i. § 124 *crudior fuit.* de fin. ii. 8, 23 *qui de conuiuiis auferantur crudique postridie se rursus ingurgitent.* Mart. xii. 76, 2 *ebrius et crudus nil habet agricola.* Sen. epp. 89, 22 *quantulum ex ista fera periculose capta dominus crudus ac nausians gustat?* Luxorius, Baehrens P.L.M. iv. 425 *inmensi soricis cattus cum membra uorasset,* | *deliciis periit crudior ille suis.* The accusative *crudum*, as far as I know, can only be supported in the sense of 'undigested,' as it is usually explained, by the solitary passage of Celsus i. 2 *qui crudum sine praecordiorum dolore ructat:* but there the meaning is uncertain: *crudum* might even be adverbial: and *crudus* in the sense of 'undigested' I take to be solecistic and late Latin. Consequently the reading *crudum* could only mean 'raw': xv. 83 *contenta cadauere crudo.* Ov. F. vi. 158 *extaque de porca cruda bimestre tenet.* Mart. xi. 57, 4 *exta cruda.* Suet. Ner. 37 *crudam carnem.* But it is absurd to suppose that the rich epicure's peacock was underdone; such an imputation on his cook is incongruous here, and could not be supported by Mart. iii. 13. *dum non uis pisces, dum non uis carpere pullos,* | *et plus quam putri, Naeuia, parcis apro,* | *accusas rumpisque cocum, tamquam omnia cruda* ('You abuse the cook for sending up all the victuals raw') | *attulerit. numquam sic ego crudus* ('dyspeptic') *ero.* Juvenal's expression for 'undigested food' is *cibus inperfectus* (iii. 233). I suspect *crudum* to be a grammarian's alteration, the product of Cornutus or Heiric of Auxerre. The errors introduced by grammarians into Latin texts are discussed in the prolegomena to my edition of Ovid's Tristia, p. lxvii. foll.

I proceed to consider *intestata*, about which Madvig (Adu. iii. 249) found a difficulty, because though indigestion may cause death, it need not have prevented the man from making his will. He therefore proposes to read *infestata*, understanding *infestata senectus* as 'old age estranged,' old age that declines to visit men ('senectus subitis his et praematuris mortibus infestatur, paucique aut nulli eam consequuntur'). But rich old men would naturally often put off making their wills till death was imminent; partly from fear of being poisoned by their prospective legatees (cp. xiii. 25, xiv. 173, 251: see Friedländer, Sittengeschichte, i. 338 foll.), and partly to keep on the alert the expectations of the legacy-hunters, by whom they were courted and whose special prey they were (cp. iv. 19, x. 202, xii. 121 ff.; Sen. epp. 95, 43, *amico aliquis aegro adsidet: probamus. at hoc hereditatis causa facit: uultur est, cadauer expectat*). Further *intestata* is required to explain *iratis amicis*: the friends are angry because the rich man has died without making a will, their attentions to him are all wasted labour (iii. 124 *perierunt tempora longi seruitii*), and so they exult over his demise (*plaudendum funus*).

I. 155–157.

pone Tigellinum: taeda lucebis in illa
qua stantes ardent qui fixo pectore fumant,
et latum media sulcum deducit harena.

deducit P *and* HVBM *published by Hosius, and Cod. Trin. Coll. Cantab. O.* 4, 10 *saec. X., of which Mr. G. R. Scott has kindly lent me his collation.* deducis, *p* s.

Translate: 'If you portray Tigellinus you will blaze amid the bonfire in which the wretches stand and burn who smoke pierced through the chest, and which bonfire draws out (flashes out) a broad streak of light in the middle of the sand' of the amphitheatre. I cannot agree with Bücheler and Friedländer in rejecting *deducit* in favour of *deducis*. The syntax is *et* (*quae taeda*) *sulcum deducit*. The relative is occasionally thus supplied: xiv. 105 *sed pater in causa, cui septima quaeque fuit lux | ignaua et* (*qui*) *partem uitae non attigit ullam.* xv. 170 *sed* (*qui*) *pectora brachia uoltum | crediderint genus esse cibi.* See Madvig, Opusc. ii. 176 = 541. Munro, Lucr. vi. 52. The meaning of *sulcum deducit* has been much disputed: that adopted was suggested by Maguire (Hermathena, ix. 422): *sulcus* = *sulcus luminis*: cp. Verg. Aen. ii. 697 (of the trail of a comet) *tum longo limite sulcus | dat lucem.* v. 527 *caelo ceu saepe refixa | transcurrunt crinemque uolantia sidera ducunt.* Lucan v. 562 *dispersos traxere cadentia sulcos | sidera.* This seems simpler than to understand *sulcum deducit* of the track of pitch and burning stuff which dripped off the stakes fastened in the ground: as this would not be broad (*latum*). So Nipperdey on Tac. A. xv. 44 and Weidner.

If *deducis* be accepted it means 'and there you are drawing a broad furrow on the midst of the sand.' The picture then is of the track left by the dead body dragged away by the uncus (x. 66): Lycophron 268 λευρᾶς βοώτης γατομῶν δι' ἄυλακος (= *sulcus* of Hector dragged by Achilles): Sen. de ira iii. 3, 6 *eculei et fidiculae et ergastula et cruces et circumdati defossis corporibus ignes, et cadauera quoque trahens uncus.* Plin. paneg. 33, 3 *nemo e spectatore spectaculum factus, miseras uoluptates unco et ignibus expiauit.* But though the present indicative is often used of actions about to be commenced (*e.g.* iii. 296), the abrupt change from the future to the present is here impossible, and is not paralleled by the far easier changes quoted by Friedländer, such as iii. 239 *si uocat... uehetur...curet*, v. 87 *qui adfertur—olebit.* Further, as Mr. Marindin observes to me, the meaning obtained is absurd: for though the body of a criminal executed in an ordinary fashion and then removed could no doubt 'describe a furrow' in the sand, the victim burnt at the stake would leave little or no body to drag, and it seems impossible to suppose that Juvenal would so describe the removal of his remains. No probable conjecture has been proposed, though *sulcum uncus ducet* (Mayor) and *sulcum dant lucis* (Dobree) deserve mention for their ingenuity.

III. 216–218.

hic nuda et candida signa,
hic aliquid praeclarum Euphranoris et Polycliti,
haec Asianorum uetera ornamenta deorum.

Haecasianorum PS, Fecasianorum *p* ALVB, ecțosianorum (o *prior post. mut. in* a) H, Fetasianorum *ex* Fecasianorum *cod. Trin. Coll. Cantab.*

The notes of the scholia are:

haec Asianorum superstitiosae gentem nominauit. *schol. Pith.*

Phaecasianorum. Phaecasiani populi sunt in cultu idolorum superstitiosi plurimos deos colentes. ipsi sunt etiam Phaeaces. *Cornutus schol.* (Höhler, p. 418).

Haec Asianorum, the reading of P, is retained by Ruperti, Lewis, Bücheler, Weidner, and Friedländer. Friedländer, following Lewis, understands *haec* to mean 'another, a woman': he considers that the introduction of a lady among the sympathetic male friends who effusively vie with one another in offering material consolation to their burnt out wealthy neighbour is in Juvenal's manner, and makes the scene more realistic: he might have quoted *horrida mater, pullati proceres* (213). This may be so: but the sudden introduction of one female among so many males, without any very obvious reason, to say nothing of that of one *haec* among so many *hic*'s, has always seemed to me strange.

Weidner, feeling this difficulty, proposes to take *haec* as accusative plural with *Polycliti*; 'another brings some masterpiece of Euphranor and these glories of temples in Asia wrought by Polyclitus in days gone by, now by Rome possessed' (*haec* these near us). But the position of *Polycliti* seems to show that it cannot be separated from *Euphranoris*; and had such been the meaning I think that *haec* would in order have preceded *Polycliti*.

Therefore, if *haec* be retained, the comma must be kept after *Polycliti*, and *haec uetera ornamenta* must be acc. pl. in apposition both to *nuda et candida signa* and *aliquid praeclarum*; 'these glories in days gone by of eastern temples.' But even then the use of *haec* in juxtaposition to four *hic*'s, in a different case from them, is awkward; and

I fancy a Roman would have written *ista* or *illa*.

It cannot then be said that the reading *haec* is satisfactory. Thus Heinrich remarks: '*haec Asianorum* ist ohne allen Zweifel corrupt,' and proposes to retain *phaecasianorum* (so Burmann on Anth. Lat. p. 608). Though admitting that *phaecasiatus* is the ordinary form of the adjective, he contends that *phaecasianus* may have been also in use, quoting Cic. ad fam. ix. 16, 8 *miniani Iouis*, which form, altered by most editors to *miniati* after Lambinus, is retained by Mendelssohn, who says that it may well have been a vulgar form of the word, like *Lenana*, *Praenestana*, *Tutanus*, *Voranus*.

Roth, following a suggestion of Ruperti, proposed *phaecasiatorum*, which alteration is adopted by Mayor.

Whether *phaecasianorum* or *phaecasiatorum* be read, the reference would be to the white leather shoe worn by the Greeks: Appian, B. C. v. 11 (speaking of the luxury of Antonius in Athens) καὶ στολὴν εἶχε τετράγωνον Ἑλληνικὴν ἀντὶ τῆς πατρίου, καὶ ὑπόδημα ἦν αὐτοῦ λευκὸν Ἀττικόν, ὃ καὶ Ἀθηναίων ἔχουσι ἱερεῖς καὶ Ἀλεξανδρέων, καὶ καλοῦσι φαικάσιον. Sen. epp. 113, 1 *puto quaedam esse quae deceant phaecasiatum palliatumque*. The word would then be contemptuous, almost equivalent to foreign, as the rogue says in Petron. 82 '*age ergo*' *inquit ille* '*in exercitu uestro phaecasiati milites ambulant?*' 'Tell me, pray, are there any fellows with foreign shoes marching in your regiment?' Juvenal's use of *stlattarius* (vii. 134) might be quoted in support of this.

Now in all textual matters the question is not whether a reading may be explained by dint of grammatical or learned ingenuity, but whether the source from which it proceeds is pure. Either we must hold that there is no best MS. of Juvenal, a position which many scholars seem to have adopted either explicitly or implicitly with regard to other authors, in which case textual criticism may be dismissed as a vain thing which it would be wise for sane persons to eschew. Or we may hold, as I do, that we have in P a pure source, a faithful guide, which though not necessarily always right, at any rate offers readings from which the truth can be extracted. It is further necessary to appreciate the relation to P of the numerous other MSS. ($p\omega$), such as those collated by Hosius the Bodleian and Trinity College, Cambridge MSS., and the Cornutus-scholia published by Höhler.

The MSS. of the ω class used to be regarded as representing the recension of Nicaeus, that of P being distinct. But Bücheler (Friedl. i. 113) has now proved that all our MSS. are drawn from the recension of Nicaeus. This follows from the fact that ω do not consistently deviate from P, but sometimes one MS. departs from it, sometimes another, while frequently many of them agree with it. The absence of the subscription *Legi ego Niceus Romae apud Seruium magistrum et emendaui* at the end of Sat. V is accounted for by the fact that there are no comments and adscripts in P at the end of Sat. V and beginning of Sat. VI, showing that something was there lost or obliterated in the original from which P was copied.

The following appears to be the history of the text. In the fourth century Nicaeus revised the text, and he or some other grammarian composed the original ancient commentary, the source of our scholia. Some time later, perhaps in the fifth century, a further recension was made by Epicarpius and Exuperantius, who repeated the commentary.

From this recension came Valla's Probus, which ends at viii. 198, and preserves the early commentary more fully than P.

Also from this recension was copied a MS., from which spring all our known MSS., of which the last sheet was lost. This accounts for all our MSS. ending abruptly at xvi. 60.

From this original were drawn P, with the abbreviated scholia Pithoeana, and the fragmentary MSS. which agree with P, the Aarau fragments and florilegium Sangallense.

Again, from this original came the further revised text of 'Cornutus,' on which was based the recension of Heiric of Auxerre, whence sprang P and ω. Whether the so called Cornutus scholia were the work of Cornutus, whoever he may have been, or of Heiric, or, as I am inclined to believe, of both, cannot be fully determined. The interlinear glosses in P, published by Lommatzsch, have nothing to do with the scholia Pithoeana, but are excerpts from the Cornutus scholia.

This theory accounts for the numerous passages in which $p\omega$ agree; and the labours of Cornutus and Heiric, and the variations which grew up in the course of transmission, account for the numerous variants in $p\omega$.

I think it will now be clear that the reading *phaecasianorum* (*phaecasiatorum*) cannot be accepted: it was produced in the laboratory of Cornutus and Heiric; the foolish explanation of the Cornutus scholia was doubtless

the work of the latter. Also I believe that I have made it appear improbable that *haec Asianorum* can be right. What then are we to read? In answering this question let us consider whether that most fertile source of error in Latin MSS., the mistaken solution of a contraction, may have caused the trouble (see Lindsay, Latin Textual Criticism, p. 90 foll.). This I believe to be the case: the contraction H', as may be seen by a glance at Chassant's Dictionnaire des Abbréviations, stands in Latin MSS. for *hic*, *haec*, or *hoc*. I propose then to restore *hic* to the text of Juvenal, as Jahn has already done in his edition of 1851, following a suggestion of Ruperti. The copyists, I imagine, introduced *haec* for *hic*, from supposing that the word agreed with *uetera ornamenta*. The tendency of MSS. to assimilate endings is well known: I have given some instances in the Classical Review, Vol. XI., p. 169, on Lucan vii. 303: see also Lindsay, p. 23 and 27.

III. 226–227.

hortulus hic puteusque breuis nec reste mouendus
in tenuis plantas facili defunditur haustu.

defunditur P. diffunditur pω.

Bücheler and Friedländer wrongly reject *defunditur* in favour of *diffunditur*: either word would apply to watering a garden; but if Juvenal can say *patulas defundere pelues* (277), why should he not say *puteus defunditur*? Further, Latin writers, particularly the poets (Postgate, Selections from Propertius p. xcv.) are so fond of the pregnant use of substantives, by which here the well stands for the water of the well, as *pelues* stands for the contents of the *pelues*, that it is unnecessary with Bücheler to put a comma at *mouendus*, and construct *diffunditur* (as he reads) impersonally 'you water your slips': this involves an asyndeton harsh for Juvenal.

S. G. Owen.

NOTES ON SOME PASSAGES OF THE *AGAMEMNON* OF AESCHYLUS.

12.

εὗτ' ἂν δὲ νυκτίπλαγκτον ἔνδροσόν τ' ἔχω
εὐνὴν ὀνείροις οὐκ ἐπισκοπουμένην
ἐμήν . . . . . .

Apart from the objections hitherto urged against ἐμήν, it is evident that to be visited by dreams is by no means desirable unless the dreams be kindly. A suggestion not yet made is

εὗτ' ἂν δὲ νυκτίπλαγκτον ἔδροσόν τ' ἔχω
εὔνοις ὀνείροις οὐκ ἐπισκοπουμένην
εὐνήν . . . . . .

In the circumstances it would be easy for εὐνήν to take the place of εὔνοις, and then (for that or other obvious reasons) become corrupted into ἐμήν in its own verse.

525.

ἦπου πάλαι φαιδροῖσι τοῖσιδ' (*sic*) ὄμμασι
δέξαισθε κώσμῳ βασιλέα πολλῷ χρόνῳ.

So *f*, but with *υ* over *α* of πάλαι. *h* has τοῖσιν and δέξαισθε. The εἶ που of editors comes from Auratus, not from MSS. The evidence therefore points to error somewhere in πάλαι or τοίσιδ' or δέξασθε or all of them. If ἦπου (or ἦ που) is right, the only tense to which δέξασθε and δέξαισθε can point is the future δέξεσθε (αι = ε).

Read therefore

ἦπου, πύλαι, φαιδροῖσι τοῖς διοίγμασι
δέξεσθε κόσμῳ βασιλέα πολλῷ χρόνῳ.

'I ween, ye gates, with joy in your wide openings will ye welcome...'

560 *sqq.*

μόχθους γὰρ εἰ λέγοιμι καὶ δυσαυλίας,
σπαρνὰς παρήξεις καὶ κακοστρώτους, τί δ' οὐ
†στένοντες, οὐ λαχόντες, ἥματος μέρος;

Perhaps nearer than previous conjectures is

τί δ' οὐ
στένοντας, οὗ λάχοι τις, ἥματος μέρος;

'and during what portion of the day in which a man's lot fell did we not groan?'. The men took their 'watches', and all the operations of any 'watch' were disagreeable. ἥματος = 'the day's work'. After the participle στένοντας the next words ουλαχοιτις might easily pass into οὐ λαχόντες.

The construction is, of course, εἰ λέγοιμι (τοὺς ἄνδρας) στένοντας πᾶν (= τί οὐ) ἥματος μέρος, οὗ τις λάχοι.

757.

δίχα δ' ἄλλων μονόφρων εἰμί. τὸ †γὰρ δυσσεβὲς ἔργον
μετὰ μὲν πλείονα τίκτει, σφετέρᾳ δ' εἰκότα γέννᾳ·
οἴκων γὰρ εὐθυδίκων
καλλίπαις πότμος αἰεί,
φιλεῖ δὲ τίκτειν Ὕβρις . . . . . κ.τ.λ.

Editors, for metre, usually follow Pauw with a transposition τὸ δυσσεβὲς γὰρ. One would like some hint as to why the contrary transposition occurred. Moreover it is usual to give no adequate value to μὲν in μετὰ μὲν κ.τ.λ., nor to the γὰρ of οἴκων γὰρ κ.τ.λ.

The chorus is combating the παλαίφατος λόγος which asserts that all great prosperity necessarily brings ruin in its train. The chorus 'thinks differently'; but surely the difference is very clumsily worked out in the text. Everything (including the misplacing of γὰρ) becomes clear if we read

τό γ' εὐσεβὲς γὰρ ἔργον κ.τ.λ.

i.e. 'I stand alone in my view; for, if a deed be *righteous*, it doth *indeed* (μὲν) beget others thereafter, *but* others like their lineage (*i.e.* righteous and good, and not ruinous). *For* when a house goes in the straight path of right, its lot is *always* one of fair children. *But* wantonness &c.'

813.

δίκας γὰρ οὐκ ἀπὸ γλώσσης θεοὶ
κλύοντες ἀνδροθνῆτας Ἰλίου φθορὰς
ἐς αἱματηρὸν τεῦχος οὐ διχορρόπως
ψήφους ἔθεντο· τῷ δ' ἐναντίῳ κύτει
Ἐλπὶς προσήει χειρὸς οὐ πληρουμένῳ.

The usual alterations or interpretations of the last clause need not be repeated. Margoliouth's προσείει is the best suggestion made upon the verb, but the chief error lies, I believe, in the case of κύτει. τεῦχος having preceded, no dative is required with ἐναντίῳ. Yet if a copyist acquainted with his Greek found himself reading τῷ δ' ἐναντίῳ κύτος he might naturally enough, whether deliberately or unconsciously, write τῷ δ' ἐναντίῳ κύτει. Such errors of 'false adaptation' are numerous enough. κύτος χειρὸς is a sufficiently good expression for 'the empty hollow of the hand' (cf. ἀσπίδος κύτος &c.), and I should therefore read

τῷ δ' ἐναντίῳ κύτος
Ἐλπὶς προσείει χειρὸς οὐ πληρουμένῳ

'while before the opposite (urn), which grows not full, Hope waves a hollow empty hand (*i.e.* containing no ψῆφος).'

869.

εἰ δ' ἦν τεθνηκὼς, ὡς ἐπλήθυον λόγοι,
τρισώματός τἂν Γηρυὼν ὁ δεύτερος
πολλὴν ἄνωθεν, †τὴν κάτω γὰρ οὐ λέγω†,
χθονὸς τρίμοιρον χλαῖναν ἐξηύχει λαβὼν.

The nonsense of the third line generally leads to its being bracketed—a resource which, it is to be hoped, satisfies no one. The general sense is 'if he had been dead as often as the multitude of messages told us he died, verily our triple-bodied Geryon the second would have boasted of putting on (ἄνωθεν λαβὼν) many times over (πολλὴν) the (τὴν) triple blanket of earth (which the first Geryon put on)' *i.e.* Agamemnon must have put on Geryon's threefold coverlet of earth many and many a time. The difficulty lies in the words following τὴν. For κατωγαρου read κατωγαίου and for λέγω read λέχους, thus

πολλὴν ἄνωθεν τὴν κατωγαίου λέχους
χθονὸς τρίμοιρον χλαῖναν ἐξηύχει λαβών

'he would have boasted of putting on many times over *that* (Geryon's) triple earth-blanket of an underground bed.'

1117.

στάσις δ' ἀκόρετος γένει
κατολολυξάτω θύματος †λευσίμου

Read γευσίμου. The great Agamemnon is a 'toothsome' morsel for the insatiable Furies. There is no appropriateness whatever about λευσίμου (see commentators).

1277.

βωμοῦ πατρῴου δ' ἀντ' ἐπίξηνον μένει
†θερμῷ κοπείσης φοινίῳ προσφάγματι.

All difficulties of sense and construction are removed by reading θερμοῦν: 'instead of (making hot) my father's altars (with sacrifice), it remains to make hot a block with the bloody sacrifice of me as the victim.'

1649.

ΑΙ. ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ δοκεῖς τάδ' ἔρδειν καὶ λέγειν,
γνώσει τάχα.
ΧΟ. εἶα δή, φίλοι λοχῖται, τοὔργον οὐκ ἑκὰς τόδε.
ΑΙ. εἶα δή, ξίφος πρόκωπον πᾶς τις εὐτρεπιζέτω.

Modern editors mark a lacuna after the

first line and give the next words to Aegistheus, while it is the chorus which says εἶα δή, ξίφος κ.τ.λ. Why? Not only is the change unnecessary; it is demonstrably wrong. The chorus are old men who certainly wear no swords and cannot at this time and place get them ready. When they reply

ἀλλὰ κἀγὼ μὴν πρόκωπος οὐκ ἀναίνομαι θανεῖν

they make no mention of swords, but refer only to such defence as they possess in the way of staves. 'I too with my hand upon my weapon's hilt . . . .'

[It is necessary to call attention to these changes of order, since (among other people) 'indolent reviewers' are apt to take a traditional order of editors rather than that of the MSS. for the basis of their nimble judgment. One such berated the present writer for 'mammocking' the order of *Supplices* 265–285, when I had simply restored the order of the MSS., while the reviewer had apparently gone no further than Paley.]

1657.

†στείχετε δ' οἱ γέροντες πρὸς δόμους πεπρωμένους
πρὶν παθεῖν †ἔρξαντα καιρόν· χρὴν τάδ' ὡς ἐπράξαμεν.

Clytemnestra is conciliatory. Emendations are numerous enough to justify another

στείχετ' αἰδοῖοι (Ahrens) γέροντες πρὸς δόμους
ἐρρωμένοι
πρὶν παθεῖν ἔρξαι τ' ἄκαιρον.

πρὸς δόμους = 'to *your* houses'. ἐρρωμένοι conveys the idea of ἔρρωσο, 'may all be well with you, farewell'. ἐρρωμένους is, of course, quite possible and may be better 'to prosperous homes'. It would be an error to suppose that τι is required with ἄκαιρον.

T. G. Tucker.

PROPERTIANA.

I hope to have an opportunity later on of supporting the following new conjectures, in common with others already published, which have been criticised in this *Review* and which appear to be worth defence.

II. v. 3, 4.

haec merui sperare? dabis mihi, perfida, poenas:
et nobis aliquo, Cynthia, uentus erit.

For *uentus* read *cursus*.

III. xxii. 21, 22.

nam quantum ferro tantum pietate potentes
stamus: uictrices temperat ira manus.

I formerly accepted *illa*, the reading of some late MS. or MSS., but *ira* appears to be genuine, and it will be enough to read *uictricis*.

IV. ii. 35–38.

In the *praefatio* to my text of Propertius I have defended an emendation of v. 35 to which I still adhere. But an alteration of the punctuation is required to restore the passage to coherence, and the sense needed in 35 may be obtained at less cost than by changing *est etiam* into *mentiar* (Housman) or *adsciscam* (myself). The four lines should be read:—

est *mea et* aurigae species *cum uerbere* et eius,
traicit alterno qui leue pondus equo,
suppetat hoc: pisces calamo praedabor, et ibo
mundus demissis institor in tunicis.

J. P. Postgate.

GRENFELL AND HUNT'S *GREEK PAPYRI.*

Greek Papyri, Series II.: New Classical Fragments and other Greek and Latin Papyri. Edited by B. P. Grenfell, M.A., and A. S. Hunt, M.A. (Oxford, 1897. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.)

Although this volume has only been published some eight months, its interest is already overshadowed by the far more extensive and important discoveries which Mr. Grenfell and Mr. Hunt have since made in their

excavations on behalf of the Egypt Exploration Fund, and of which a sample has been published in the shape of the 'Logia' fragment. The discoveries of 1897 threaten, in fact, to rival those of 1891; and hence the value of this volume, which contains only very small literary fragments and a number of non-literary documents, is in danger of being overlooked. In any ordinary year, however, it would have been welcomed as an interesting addition to our knowledge. The literary fragments, though small, have in several cases special points of interest; the non-literary documents include many in very good condition, and several which belong to classes of which no specimens have hitherto been published; there are some interesting examples of early Christian documents; and the whole is excellently edited in a convenient form. A further point of value, though not much represented in this edition, is that of palaeography, since a number of the papyri belong to the years just on either side of A.D. 300 and A.D. 400, which happen to be periods for which our information has hitherto been very scanty.

Among the literary papyri there is nothing quite so interesting as the Erotic Fragment which formed the *pièce de rêsistance* of Mr. Grenfell's previous volume; but the first place is no doubt held by the fragment of Pherecydes. It is not large,—only some twenty-five short lines are perfect or approximately so,—and it is a curious accident that so small a fragment should have included one of the known quotations from Pherecydes, whereby Mr. Leaf was able to identify it. Short as it is, however, it subverts the interpretation which had generally been put upon the quotation, and shows that the narrative (that of the wedding of Zeus and Hera) was more simple and less allegorical than has been supposed. Next in interest come the Homeric fragments of the third century B.C., from *Il.* iv. viii. xxi.–xxiii., which, like the fragments of the same period published by Mahaffy and Nicole, contain several lines not found in our vulgate text. Out of eleven lines from book iv., four are new, and out of eighty-four lines from books xxi.–xxiii., ten appear to be new, though in some cases the smallness of the fragments causes some uncertainty. Further, in one case, a line appearing here but not in the vulgate is actually quoted by Plutarch. It is obvious that this repetition of the phenomenon first brought into notice by the Petrie fragment puts the matter into quite a different light. A single example of an expanded Iliad carried little weight, and could easily be reconciled with existing knowledge; but it is a different matter when all the earliest Homer-papyri are found to be of the same type. It is true that all our fragments probably come from the same district of Egypt; it is also true that the additional lines are not of a striking character; but the fact remains that in a district of Egypt largely inhabited by Greeks the text of Homer in circulation in the third century B.C. was apparently one containing a much larger number of lines than that which has come down to us. When and how these divergent texts were suppressed, and what is the true origin of the vulgate text, are questions which the Homeric critic will be required to consider. The one clear fact which seems deducible from the phenomena before us is that the text continued to be in a fluctuating and unsettled condition much later than has commonly been believed.

The other literary pieces in this volume are not of great importance. They include several small scraps of unidentified prose and verse, some of which are palaeographically interesting on account of their very archaic appearance. Mr. Grenfell's remarks on their date, in comparison with that of the Petrie *Phaedo* and *Antiope*, are very just and sensible. Even these tiny scraps have considerable palaeographical value, when they are in literary hands and can be approximately dated. The identifiable literary fragments include portions of Demosthenes, *De Fals. Leg.* 10, and *Contra Phorm.* 6, 7, and Xenophon *Mem.* I. 3, 15–4, 3 (identified by Gomperz and others since the publication of the volume).

The non-literary documents are much more numerous and range over nearly the whole of the period during which papyri are known, from the latter half of the second century B.C. to the time of the Arab rule in the eighth century. Three or four small documents are earlier, from the third century B.C., and one vellum leaf contains liturgical matter which may be as late as the ninth century. The Ptolemaic documents do not call for much notice, being of the same type as those contained in Mr. Grenfell's previous volume; but they are good specimens of their kind and in excellent condition. The Roman documents contain more novelties; for though papyri of the same classes are in the British Museum, Mr. Grenfell is the first to publish them. They include returns of camels for the purposes of the annual census of live-stock (several of these have already been published among the Berlin

papyri), an interesting and novel series of receipts for taxes paid upon goods passing through the village custom-houses, which throw light upon the trade routes of the Fayum, a collection of certificates of work done upon the embankments, which show that five days' labour for this purpose was required from the villagers in each year, and a number of other tax-receipts and similar documents, which, in conjunction with the papyri and ostraka in Berlin, London, and elsewhere, help to build up our knowledge of the economical condition of Roman Egypt into something like a system. They are, however, so miscellaneous, and relate singly to such minute details, that it is useless to attempt to discuss them here.

A special interest attaches to a number of papyri from the Byzantine period, which are ecclesiastical in character. Among them is a portion of the Festal Letter of some bishop unknown, announcing to his clergy the date of Easter in the current year, which is probably A.D. 577; part of a deacon's litany, in corrupt Coptic Greek; and an inventory of church property. Mr. C. H. Turner and Mr. Brightman contribute some information upon these documents.

Mr. Grenfell's work is so accurate (and the same remark applies to Mr. Hunt) that a reviewer has little to do beyond describing and classifying the contents of his volumes; and I have not as yet been able to examine in detail even all those of the original documents which are now in the British Museum. A few queries and corrections may be placed upon record. In xv. 5 [ὄν]των should be [οὐ]σῶν, both because the priesthoods in question are those of females and because the papyrus appears to have σ. In xvi. 1 the date is apparently corrected from λδ to λε, and the name of the lady who figures in this document and the two following seems to be fairly decipherable as Τακμῆις or Τακμηοῦς throughout. The abbreviation in line six seems to be that for χ(αλκοῦ), not δραχμῶν. In xx. 3 I should read ἀπὸ, not ἀπ', and in col. 2 l. 2 ἱερειῶν, not ἱερέως. In xxiii. 5 ἀναγομένων should be δηλουμένων, and with regard to the note on this papyrus, it may be suggested that possibly the bank of the Latopolite nome was kept at Pathyris, although that town (or village) was in the Pathyrite nome. Crocodilopolis was apparently the chief town of the upper toparchy of the Pathyrite nome, and Pathyris may probably have been in the lower toparchy, bordering the Latopolite nome. Pathyris, by the way, has not, so far as I know, been identified with Thebes as a whole, but with a suburb of Thebes on the left bank; but the identification is very questionable. In xxiiia., col. 3, the division into lines of the original is not followed. No. xxviii. should apparently be described as a re-sale by Sennesis to Petearsemtheus (the student of papyri must become accustomed to such euphonious names as these) of land bought from him two years previously. This will obviate some of the confusions presupposed in the notes. In l. 14 it is not necessary to suppose that πόταμος or ὅρος has dropped out, the word περίχωμα being in the MS. In l. 17 τ' is inserted by an oversight. In xxxi. 12 the MS. (erroneously) has τόκου, not τόκους. In xxxii, the τοῦ which stands at the beginning of l. 2 should be at the end of l. 1, and in l. 13 ἄρου(ραν) should be restored, not ἀρούρας. The MS. in xxxiii. 7 has συνπλήρωσαν, not συμ—. In xxxv. 5 ἐλάσσω(ν) should be read, not ἐλάσσω. In xxxvi. 12 ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων ἐπιμεμέληται seems to mean 'but on the contrary has assisted us,' rather than 'but has used our difficulties to assist us.' In xxxix. 3 the MS. has ζυτοποις, in xlvα. 17 συ(μφωνῶ), in xlviα. 7 perhaps ἐπίτροποι rather than ἐπίτιμοι, in xlix. 9 not ἀπογρ(αφῇ), but συναπογρ(αψάμενος), ἀπογραφῇ having been accidentally omitted. The street named in l. 13 is probably Βουταφίου. In lviii. 2 the lacuna should be supplied (from a similar certificate in the British Museum) Προσωπίτου καὶ [Λητοπολίτου παρ]ὰ (?). In lix. 3 ἐγ λη(μμάτων) μη(νὸς) προ(τέρου) should be ἐγλήμπτορο(ς), which involves an alteration in the summary of the document's contents. In the same papyrus Χοιάχ, Θώμι, and Παούλιος should probably be Χοιακ', Θ<έ>ωνι, and Παουήτιος, and τοῦ is inserted by mistake before τελέσματος in l. 6. In lxi. 15 ἔσχ[ε] should probably, on grounds of sense, be ἔσχ[ον]. No. lxiiα. must belong to the first half of the second century; for the strategus Hierax mentioned in it cannot be the strategus of that name under Caracalla, since the fifteenth year of that reign is already appropriated by one Dionysius. No. lxvii. is apparently addressed to the προνοητὴς αὐλ(ητρίδων), not γυμ(νασίου), and this suits the contents better. The two last lines should run τοῦ ἱερωτάτου Καίσαρος [Σεβ]ασ[το]ῦ υἱοῦ [τοῦ Σε]βαστοῦ. The beginning of lxxiv. 4 may be Ἀπιανῷ Κα[ί]ου. In lxxvii. 38 δωλῆτε may be διάγητε. The name of the consul in lxxx. 2 seems to be rightly spelt Φρουιττᾶ.

Here my examination of the originals ceases. It will be seen at once, by anyone who has any acquaintance with papyri, that the points that have been noted here are, for

the most part, the merest minutiae, in some cases hardly worth the trouble of writing down. In dealing with the cursive and often damaged writing of papyri, there will always be a certain amount of gleaning to be done after any editor; but after Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt the gleaning is scanty and unimportant. In conclusion, it may be permissible to congratulate them, not only on the good work contained in the volume which has just been reviewed, but on the prospect of interesting and important work held out to them for many years to come in the colossal discoveries made by them last winter on behalf of the Egypt Exploration Fund; and one may be allowed to call the attention of the readers of the *Classical Review* to the new Graeco-Roman branch of the Fund which has now been set on foot, to which we may most hopefully look for important discoveries in the field of lost Greek literature.

F. G. Kenyon.

LINDSAY'S *INTRODUCTION TO LATIN TEXTUAL EMENDATION.*

An Introduction to Latin Textual Emendation, based on the Text of Plautus. By W. M. Lindsay, M.A., Fellow of Jesus College, (Oxford. Macmillan. 1896. pp. xii, 131. Price 3*s.* 6*d.*)

Perhaps the best recommendation of Mr. Lindsay's unpretending little book is the fact that it has been placed in the list of books recommended to students for section A of the second part of the Cambridge Classical Tripos, the only examination in English universities for which the textual criticism of classical authors is specifically prescribed. Profound and exhaustive of course it is not, and it deals too little with principles to be pronounced quite a 'satisfactory handbook.' But beginners will find it very useful, and some even of those who write as experts upon subjects of textual criticism and palaeography might read it with profit. Its most serviceable feature is the list of MS. corruptions with illustrative examples which it contains, while the most interesting is the variety of notes gathered from a number of quarters upon miscellaneous points connected with the history and composition of Latin codices. It was very natural that Mr. Lindsay should suppose that 'there is no Latin author the study of whose text has at once such interest and such value for students of textual emendation as Plautus.' Others however will consider that it would have been better had the area of choice not been limited to a single author, and that one involving so many difficult and unsettled problems, metrical and otherwise, as Plautus. Though Mr. Lindsay generally keeps his eye upon practical considerations, he sometimes shows a lack of circumspection. The recent misleading distinction between the vowel and semi-vowel *u* and *i* should be avoided above all in a treatise upon Latin palaeography. But Mr. Lindsay writes not only *v* but even the discredited *j*. In an appendix he gives minute and useful directions to the intending collator of a Latin MS. But he ought to have said plainly that, to begin with, *every* point in which the MS. collated differs from the text used for the purposes of collation should be noted, abbreviations (when of not unusual form) being indicated by the convenient practice of underlining the letters abbreviated. As the work of collation proceeds, the collator can drop the record of minutiae which prove to be unimportant, noting of course the point at which he does so. In particular the collator should be warned against the danger in attempting too much in discriminating the various hands in corrections. Collations have often been rendered completely useless by the ascription to the first hand of later corrections and vice versa. It would not be fair in a notice of this length to dwell much upon flaws in detail; but a weakness in the grammatical region is indicated by the suggestions that *sum libere* should be read in *Epidicus* 498 in the sense of *sum libera* and that *uitam uiuitur* Ennius is an adequate parallel to the impossible *epityra* (acc. of the direct obj.) *estur* which Mr. Lindsay proposes in *Miles* 24, while the explanation of *luci claro* 'in broad daylight,' '*luci* being regarded as an adverb and therefore independent of distinctions of gender, is joined with the neuter of the adjective,' (p. 27) is hardly short of amazing. The statement on p. 73, 'These errors of substitution [*f* for *ph*, *e* for *ae*, *oe*, &c.] in mediæval MSS. are rather mistakes of eye than mistakes of ear' is beside the mark and may easily mislead. The reason why a scribe writes *febus* for *phoebus* or *coena* for *cena* is that in his pronunciation the interchanged symbols stood for identical sounds and one spelling was more familiar than the other.

J. P. P.

DIELS' *PARMENIDES.*

Parmenides: Lehrgedicht: griechisch und deutsch: von Hermann Diels. (Berlin, Reimer. 1897. 5 M.)

This edition of the fragmentary poem of Parmenides has a curious interest for the archaeologist as well as for the student of Greek thought. For out of 160 pages, including the fragments and the translation, 47 are devoted to an excursus on doors, locks, keys and bolts in ancient Greece, occasioned, of course, by the mention of the etherial gates of day and night, of which Justice holds κληῖδας ἀμοιβούς. As the object of this slight notice is to call attention to the work, and not to criticize it, I will only say here that the author, before stating his own view, has elaborately discussed the opinions of Autenrieth, Hensell, Protodicos of Paros (a modern Greek), and Fink, and that he gives profuse illustrations from the monuments, showing how according to each system the ὀχεύς (Riegel), κληίς (Schlüssel), βάλανοι (Fallklötzchen), ἱμάς (Riemen), χελώνιον (Schlüsselloch), are supposed to work.

In the introduction (27 pages) one of the most striking points is the suggested association of Parmenides with the 'Orphic' movement of the sixth century B.C., a religious awakening, which, as Professor Diels imagines, must have sprung up simultaneously at many places in Hellas. The same breadth of treatment shows itself in his recognition of the vision at the opening as a particular example of a widespread form of literature: 'Es wäre reizvoll die Geschichte der poetischen Vision durch die Weltlitteratur zu verfolgen, von der Hadesfahrt des thesprotischen Odysseus und der babylonischen Ištar bis zu Dante's Komödie und Hanneles Himmelfahrt.'

The editor shows a wise caution in constituting this very peculiar text. He despairs of restoring it as at first written, partly because the dialect of Elea is scarcely at all known, and abstains from the insertion even of plausible conjectures. In the often-canvassed line οὐ γὰρ μὴ ποτε τοῦτο δαμῇ, εἶναι μὴ ἐόντα, he retains δαμῇ, which he explains as equivalent to ἀναγκασθῇ. He notices Dr. Jackson's conjecture οὐ...δάμ' ἧ as 'ingenious but impossible.' Such a *tmesis* of οὐδαμά, indeed, can hardly be sustained. But granting the difficulty of supposing a line so often quoted *literatim* to be corrupt, I still incline to the more obvious φατῇ.

His interpretation is marked by similar caution. I will only venture one remark. His note on Ἠλιάδες κοῦραι runs as follows: 'sie stammen von der Sonne. Sie sind die Lichtelfen. Darum eilen sie in ihre Heimat, wohin sie den nach dem Licht strebenden Denker geleiten. In ἠλιάδες ist kaum mehr angedeutet als in Schillers *Sonnenwandrer*, der am Markstein der Schöpfung steht, oder in Göthes *Sonnenpferden* der Zeit. . . . Jeder mythologische Rückstand ist hier in der rein logisch gedacht Allegorie verdampft.'

Is this quite justifiable? An advanced Greek thinker of the sixth century might innovate in mythology, as Aeschylus still does, but his imaginings would surely be less vague than this. I know that my conjecture involves a divergence from the orthodox theogony, but since I first read the poem I have always fancied these 'daughters of the Sun' to be the Ὧραι,

τῆς ἐπιτέτραπται μέγας Οὐρανὸς Οὔλυμπός τε
ἠμὲν ἀνακλῖναι πυκινὰν νέφος ἠδ' ἐπιθεῖναι.

The moment for the new revelation had arrived:—the Hour led the way for the Man. I might match Professor Diels' reference to Schiller and Goethe by quoting from the final scene of Shelley's Prometheus Unbound. But I leave this to the reader.

Lewis Campbell.

HOW AND LEIGH'S ROMAN HISTORY.

A History of Rome to the Death of Caesar. By W. W. How, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of Merton College, Oxford, and H. D. Leigh, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Corpus Christi College, (Oxford. Longmans, Green & Co. 1896. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

This book may be described as Mommsen done into vigorous and racy English. It is an admirable book and supplies a decided want. In the authors' very modest preface they say that their main object is to develope the history of the Roman Constitution, at once so similar and dissimilar to that of England: and herein they have been eminently successful in setting forth the results of Mommsen and his school. They have done so with less light and shade and more truth in

the delineation of character (*e.g.* in those of Pompey and Cicero); and they have wisely dwelt with less insistence upon merely formal state-law, so that the great sweep of the development of the constitution may come more prominently into view. Nothing could be better than the pause they make in the middle of their narrative (chapters 28 to 31), wherein they trace during the latter half of the third and beginning of the second centuries the growth of that glaring contrast of form and fact, of principles and practice, which is such a marked feature of the later Republican times. 'The old policy of graduated privilege and regular promotion fell into oblivion; exclusion was the order of the day. At home the oligarchy masqueraded as a republic: in Italy despotism masqueraded as alliance' (p. 309). Salient features are brought out by striking, well-considered phrases *e.g.* 'Religion was lost in worship' (290); 'The Senate was a sort of dictatorship in commission' (298), and 'formed the professional governing class' (299); the Comitia was an 'atrophied member' of the body politic (298). 'The path to power lay in family influence, in a strong *clientela*, in the arts of the advocate, the showman and the election-manager' (301). The provinces were the 'milch-cows' of the Roman nobles (311). Cato the Censor is described as 'a political gladiator and typical Roman, a hard-hitting, sharp-witted, keenly commercial, upright, vulgar Philistine' (303). And the authors strike a note of grandeur when they tell how Marius 'died the horror of Rome of which he had been in turns the glory and the jest' (438).

These passages give a fair idea of the vigour of the style, and the keen insight into the Roman state and the Roman statesmen which the authors possess. Sometimes perhaps the style is even a little too racy. After Sulla left Rome for the East 'the opposition was a "syndicate of the discontented," whose figure-head, for want of a better was that shoddy saviour of society, called L. Cornelius Cinna' (434). Now and then possibly remarks might have been made on the significance of apparently unimportant measures *e.g.* the opinion of Diodorus (xxxv. 25) about the pernicious tampering with the discipline of the army in certain laws of C. Gracchus (p. 349). Sometimes we miss the notice of what would seem an important point in the development of custom: *e.g.* in the account of Caesar's Agrarian law of 59 (p. 300) it might have been noticed that the principle that military service gave a claim to land was not as yet recognized; the grant was to *citizens*, and the soldiers were merely recommended to the consideration of the commissioners. Many similar points might be urged: but they are minute and comparatively unimportant. On the whole the accuracy of the facts related and the effective manner in which they are grouped deserve the highest praise. Of course for both of these features in their work the authors would be the first to allow that they are indebted in a large measure to Mommsen: but it is no small achievement to have so completely mastered that scholar's work as to be able to reproduce it accurately in such rapid and at the same time concise and lucid narrative. This is the great value of the work. Scientific Roman History is made attractive for younger students who would be deterred from it by the four large volumes and the ponderous and unusual phraseology of Mommsen himself. As regards the production of the book nothing is to be desired. The print is clear, the maps numerous and useful, and the illustrations in all cases thoroughly authentic and most instructive.

A new edition of the book is doubtless near at hand. Perhaps Messrs. How and Leigh would consider the advisability of continuing the history to the Battle of Actium. True, from the time of Caesar the monarchy was virtually established, and the struggle between Antony and Octavian was only a question who was to be the monarch: yet histories of the Empire generally begin after the death of Antony, and accordingly the years 44–31 are more or less ignored. We think the authors would make the history of that period of the industrious and the idle apprentice interesting and vivid. Again, possibly they might see their way to giving in a list references to the principal original authorities and the chief modern works which deal with the several events. Perhaps they might number the paragraphs continuously and at the end of the volume give the references to the authorities for the chief statements in each paragraph, somewhat after the manner followed in Mr. Herbert Spencer's writings. It would be no doubt a task of considerable labour: but it would be eminently useful to the students who wished to prosecute their studies further; it would not increase appreciably the bulk of the volume; and it would not interfere with those who wished simply to read and to enjoy.

L. C. Purser.

HOLMES' *INDEX TO LYSIAS.*

Index Lysiacus Davidis H. Holmes, Ph.D. Bonn (F. Cohen. 1895. Pp. 213. 8 M.)

Students of the Attic Orators, after having long had to rest content with the very meritorious but inadequate indices of Reiske, are now fortunate in having access to far completer works of reference in the indices to several of those orators which have been published during the last few years. Thus, we now have the Index to Demosthenes (1892) and Aeschines (1896) by Preuss, and that to Antiphon by Van Cleef (1895), while indices to Andocides, Lycurgus and Dinarchus by Dr. L. L. Forman have very recently been published by the Clarendon Press. Among all such aids to the study of the normal Attic Prose of public life in the fourth century, a place of honour must be assigned to the laborious and accurate *Index Lysiacus* of Dr. David Holmes, a scholar educated in the United States and in Germany, whose work is dedicated to Professor Gildersleeve and Professors Huebner and Usener, and is published at Bonn, the University of the professor last mentioned. The work, as explained in the preface, does not profess to be a *lexicon* or a *thesaurus*, but only a practically complete *index* to Lysias, the only items purposely omitted being such common words as the article, and δέ and καί. It is perhaps to be regretted that the compiler of this very useful work has not gone further in the way of grouping and classifying his references. Thus under δίκην we have a bare enumeration of more than ninety passages where the word occurs. It would have been far more useful if these references had been grouped under such phrases as δίκην λαβεῖν, δίκην δοῦναι, &c. There are other technical terms which might have similarly deserved a fuller treatment, such as ἄδεια, ἀπογράφειν, ἀφαιρεῖσθαι, δοκιμάζειν, καταλέγειν, and λειτουργία. However, even under the limitations which the compiler of the index has set himself, the work will be found most useful. If we may borrow an epithet from the orator himself, we may add that scholars will be duly grateful for a λειτουργία ἐπιπονωτάτη which has been so successfully accomplished.

J. E. Sandys.

WATTENBACH'S *SCHRIFTWESEN IM MITTELALTER.*

Das Schriftwesen im Mittelalter, von W. Wattenbach. Dritte vermehrte Auflage. (Leipzig. Hirzel. 1896. 14 M.)

The death of Wilhelm Wattenbach, at the age of seventy-eight, which took place last September, removes from the world of letters one who might be fairly regarded as the *doyen* of palaeographical studies. He was not by any means only a palaeographer, but it was in that capacity that he was best known among classical scholars; and for just thirty years his books have been recognized as holding a prominent position in the literature of the subject. His *Anleitung zur griechischen Palaeographie* was first published in 1867, his companion volume on Latin palaeography in 1869, and his *Schriftwesen im Mittelalter* in 1871. In 1876 he published, in collaboration with Dr. Zangemeister, his *Exempla Codicum Latinorum litteris majusculis scriptorum*, and two years later his *Exempla Codicum Graecorum litteris minusculis scriptorum*, this time in partnership with von Velsen. Since these dates no new work on palaeography appeared from his pen, but the old ones were from time to time brought up to date. The *Anleitung zur lateinischen Palaeographie* reached its fourth edition in 1886, while the third edition of the *Anleitung zur griechischen Palaeographie* was noticed in these columns in December, 1895; and now comes the third edition of the *Schriftwesen*, which, like both its companions, has undergone material expansion since its first appearance. The second edition, published in 1875, contained 569 pages, while the present issue reaches a total of 670, which is in itself evidence that the revision has not been of a perfunctory character.

The strongest point in Prof. Wattenbach's work is his bibliography. His books contain, in every case, a full survey of the literature of the subject; and no doubt the articles which he contributed annually to the *Jahres-*

berichte der Geschichtswissenschaft served to keep him posted up in all the most recent publications. The *Schriftwesen*, however, contains more original work than either of the *Anleitungen*, and must be regarded as Prof. Wattenbach's most important contribution to palaeography. It is superfluous to describe at length a work which has been well known for twenty years as one of the foremost authorities on the subject. In seven sections (apart from an introductory survey of the literature of the subject) it treats of (1) the materials for writing, (2) forms of books and charters, (3) the manner of writing (preparation of the material, writing implements, ink etc.), (4) the revision and decoration of the written manuscript, (5) the scribes (a very useful section), (6) the sale of books, (7) libraries and archives. In all these sections considerable additions have been made, and the mass of information now collected is very great. Here and there it might be possible to make additions or alterations, as is inevitable in a work which abounds with details, and were the author alive it might be of some slight service to do so; but they would affect quite an infinitesimal proportion of the book. The whole treatise is excellent, and includes a mass of knowledge which few, if any, palaeographers now left alive could equal.

F. G. Kenyon.

OBITUARY.

GEORGE MARTIN LANE.

FREDERIC DE FOREST ALLEN.

In the death of Professors Lane and Allen classical scholarship in America has suffered a great calamity and Harvard University an irreparable loss. Associated in service as they had been for a long period of years and dying within a few weeks of each other, it is fitting that they should together receive recognition in a brief tribute of admiration and affection which is offered by friends and colleagues.

George Martin Lane was born December 24, 1823, in Charlestown, Massachusetts, and died in Cambridge, July 30, 1897, after a year of feeble health. He was of good New England stock, the first Lane in America having come to Dorchester, in Massachusetts, in 1635. He entered Harvard College in 1842, and was graduated with the degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1846. Among the members of his class were Professor Charles Eliot Norton, Senator Hoar, and the late Professor F. J. Child. After graduation he gave some instruction in Latin in the College, and then went to Germany, where he had as fellow students Gildersleeve, Wölfflin, Baumeister and other well-known scholars. He received the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Göttingen—his dissertation being upon the history and antiquities of Smyrna, —and immediately became Professor of Latin at Harvard University. This position, with unimportant changes of title, he held for forty-three years. Upon his retirement in 1894, the University recognized his services to classical learning by conferring upon him the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws, and his services to herself by appointing him professor *emeritus*, with a generous pension. Two years later, in commemoration of the happy completion of fifty years since he had received his first degree in Arts, seventeen of his recent colleagues or former pupils united in dedicating to him the Lane Volume of the *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, to which each had contributed an article.

His long term of service and his popularity as a teacher brought him into contact with many generations of undergraduates in Harvard College, upon all of whom his personality was strongly impressed. In later years, with the development of advanced instruction, his courses were much sought by graduate students in Classical Philology. His favourite authors were Plautus, Lucretius, Horace, Tacitus, and Quintilian, and to their elucidation he brought profound learning, critical acumen, sympathetic appreciation, and a delicate taste. The marginalia on his private copies of these and other writers abound in happy suggestions in the way of illustration, ex-

position or emendation. It is hoped that some of these may be printed.

In Professor Lane, both as a teacher and scholar, were happily united faculties and qualities which, though not often found together, in combination produce the very highest type of scholarship. These were a prodigious memory, minute and accurate knowledge, great originality and independence, a fine literary sense, together with the power of lucid and pungent statement, the faculty of taking infinite pains, and a bright and lambent humour. In brief, he seemed to his pupils to represent all that quick wit and intellectual finish can attain to.

Impatient of imperfect or unfinished work in himself—with perhaps too high an ideal of perfection—he wrote but little for publication, especially of late. A series of notable articles and reviews in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* and in the *North American Review*, between 1853 and 1865—on German universities, Latin lexicography, and kindred themes,—a short tract on Latin pronunciation (1871), which did more than anything else to bring about a reform in the pronunciation of Latin in American colleges, a multitude of notes in the New York *Nation*, a few notes in the *Harvard Studies*—these will constitute nearly the entire list. He had, however, as is well known, been long engaged upon a Latin grammar and had brought it to the final stages of completion. It is good to know that this grammar, which one of the writers of these words has been permitted to examine, is to be published after no long lapse of time, the editor being Professor Morris H. Morgan, a favorite pupil of Professor Lane. It shows all the qualities of its author's mind, originality of treatment, finish in execution, extraordinary felicity in language, and a skill in the translations which at times amounts to genius. In this book and in a few articles which it is hoped will be published posthumously, much of Professor Lane's influence on classical scholarship will be perpetuated, but he will by no means only so survive. He will chiefly live, as all great teachers live, in the lives and activities of his pupils and friends. He was ever ready with counsel and help for all who came to him, and he gave both unweariedly and unselfishly. Not a few of the leading contributions of America to classical scholarship owe much of their excellence to his co-operation. For example, Dr. Lewis, the chief editor of the Harper's Latin Lexicons, says in the preface to the School edition: 'If it shall be found within its prescribed limits to have attained in any degree that fulness, that minute accuracy and that correspondence with the ripest scholarship and the most perfect methods of instruction which are its aims, the result is largely due to his counsel and assistance.'

Of Professor Lane's personal qualities this is perhaps not the place to speak at length. He was a charming companion, radiant with good humour, a delightful raconteur, a famous wit, a most welcome guest, a faithful friend,—respected and admired by all and beloved especially of children. All will mourn the master, those most who knew him best.

Frederic de Forest Allen was born in Oberlin, Ohio, May 25, 1844, and died suddenly on August 4, 1897, at Portsmouth, New Hampshire. His father, though from Massachusetts, was one of the earliest students of Oberlin College, and soon after graduation was appointed to a professorship in the college which he held for thirty years. Growing up in a professor's family, young Allen was prepared for college at an early age, and received the degree of Bachelor of Arts when he was barely nineteen years old. Only three years later he was called to teach Greek and Latin in the East Tennessee University, but soon took a leave of absence for two years for study in Leipsic, where he obtained his degree of Doctor of Philosophy in 1870, with a thesis *De Dialecto Locrensium*, which was published in the third volume of Georg Curtius's *Studien*. Although he heard Ritschl, Overbeck, and others, his chief work was with Curtius, who had a high regard for Allen's ability and exercised a deep influence on his studies and teaching. He was the best illustration in America of Curtius's training and method, and especially in his early years gave himself to linguistic rather than literary studies. From Tennessee he went for a year to Harvard as instructor, but was appointed in 1874 professor of Latin and Greek in the newly founded University of Cincinnati. After five years of service there, he was called to the professorship of Greek at Yale which had been made vacant by the death of James Hadley; but after a single year of New Haven, where his duties were exclusively with undergraduate classes, he was invited in 1880 to the newly established chair of Classical Philology at Harvard, and accepted the invitation, much to the

regret of his colleagues at Yale. This position was congenial to him since it united the two classical languages for his field, and especially since it brought him into connexion chiefly with graduate students, and thus gave him an opportunity to exercise his unusual powers for guiding and stimulating advanced students in their investigations.

In 1882, Professor Allen was president of the American Philological Association, and at its meeting that year gave an interesting address on the University of Leyden and its relation to Classical Studies. During the academic year 1885–86, he served as Director of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. In this capacity he conducted the negotiations for the cession of the ground for the School's building on the slope of Lycabettus, and began the excavations which the School was to undertake, by the direction of work on the site of the little rural theatre at Thoricus.

Professor Allen's most important published works were his revision of Hadley's Greek Grammar, an edition with commentary of Euripides' *Medea*, a translation of Wecklein's commentary and introduction to the *Prometheus* of Aeschylus, *Remnants of Early Latin* (which was used not only at home but also as the basis of lectures in German Universities), and *Greek Versification in Inscriptions* (which was printed in the fourth volume of the *Papers* of the School at Athens). New editions of the Grammar and the Remnants were in preparation at the time of his death. Perhaps the most signal of his minor works was *Ueber den Ursprung des Homerischen Versmasses*, which appeared in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift* in the autumn of 1878. He contributed several papers to the Transactions of the American Philological Association; other papers were published in the *American Journal of Philology*, and in the *Harvard Studies*, with a few reviews and notes in the New York *Nation* and in this Review, and some articles in encyclopedias. His published works, however, in amount very imperfectly represented his attainments and his researches. He cared nothing for the glory of discovery, and observed the Horatian *nonum prematur in annum;* indeed many of his most striking and interesting views have never been published. He gave to his courses of lectures unstinted care, and each of these contained an extraordinary amount of entirely new material. The titles of some of his most notable courses follow: Roman Religion and Worship; Religion and Worship of the Greeks; Greek Grammar, with study of dialectic Inscriptions; Latin Grammar; Elements of Oscan and Umbrian; History of Greek Literature; Roman Comedy. One of his most important unfinished works is a new edition of the *Scholia* to Plato, for which he had made a careful collection of the Bodleian and Paris MSS., during the winter and spring of 1891–92, and for which he was planning to make a collation of the Venetian MSS. in his next 'sabbatical' year, 1898–99. His collations are beautifully neat and clear, and doubtless may be used by some other scholar, but many of his observations and inferences died with him.

Professor Allen inherited unusual musical taste and powers. His work on Homeric verse and versification in Greek inscriptions showed his skill in dealing with metrical problems, and few men knew more than he about ancient music. In music he found his chief recreation after severer studies, and composed the music for two operettas and a pantomime, as well as for the *cantica* of the Harvard representation of the *Phormio* in 1894.

Although he was not in any sense an athlete, Professor Allen was a faithful member of the Appalachian Mountain Club, and climbed many of the peaks of Switzerland and the Tyrol, and again and again visited the higher summits of the White Mountains in New Hampshire.

Professor Allen was remarkable for the accuracy and breadth of his knowledge, for the perfection of his philological method, for the sanity of his judgment, for his skill and precision in the statement of truth and for his success in guiding beginners to investigations, for his conscientious devotion to philological research, for his warmth of heart, for the 'simplicity and godly sincerity' which were manifest equally in his daily life and his philological studies, and for his unselfishness. He has long been recognized as the first American philologist of his generation, and in view of the work which in the course of nature he might have been expected to do in the later years of his life, his death is one of the heaviest blows that could have fallen upon classical learning in our land.

W. G. Hale.
T. D. Seymour.
J. H. Wright.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

MONTHLY RECORD.

BRITAIN.

Acsica (Great Chesters) on the Roman Wall.—Two altars (one dedicated to Jupiter Dolichenus) and two inscriptions, together with some denarii of the earlier Emperors, have come to light in the course of the excavations which are being made by the Newcastle Society of Antiquaries. The style of the masonry and the bonding of the N.W. turret point to the camp being of the same date as the murus.[1]

SWITZERLAND.

Boden (Ct. Aargau).—The front of the complex of buildings lying along the Roman road has been laid bare. The foundations of a long colonnade, extending along the side of the road, show that Herr Meyer, the excavator, has found the site of some public building. Excavations at a fresh spot, S.W. of the site hitherto explored, have produced some valuable finds, including a four-footed bronze candelabrum standing on a square block of polished granite, and a bronze figure of a faun, about 18 cm. high, said to be of excellent workmanship.[1]

ITALY.

Civita Alba (near Arcevia). — An Etrusco-Gallic temple has been discovered, decorated with terracotta figures of peculiar style, representing mythological and historical scenes.[1]

GREECE.

Athens.—Further details are to hand respecting the excavations on the north-west face of the Acropolis (see above, p. 173). As regards the grottoes of Apollo and Pan, it appears (Ἐφημ. Ἀρχ. 1897, parts 1 and 2) that the more western of the two was after the Persian Wars sacred to Apollo alone (Ἀπόλλωνι ὑπὸ μακραῖς, ὑπ' ἄκραις, ὑπακραίος, these being merely local designations of the Pythian Apollo, although there is no epigraphic evidence to show whether the grotto itself was actually called τὸ Πύθιον). This grotto is merely a shallow opening in the face of the rock, so that it can hardly have been the scene of Apollo's affair with Creusa. But connected with this grotto is a group of passages in the rock, to which two openings admit, and which are less exposed to public view. After the Persian Wars, when a sanctuary was required for Pan, that god received this more secret cave which had previously belonged to Apollo.—In front of one of the two openings into Pan's grotto begins a steep path leading up the face of the rock to a doorway (now built up) through the Acropolis wall. This is the ὀπή through which one of Lysistrata's women passed (Aristoph. *Lys.* 720). The excavations show that between Pan's grotto and the Klepsydra in which Myrrhine is told to bathe (v. 913) there cannot have been any wall such as some have supposed to exist. —A hole in the rock between the two grottoes may be the 'grave of Erechtheus' (Eur. *Ion*, 281 ff.).—Exactly south of the chapel of the Seraphim begins a subterranean passage 33 metres long, leading to a cleft in the rock, sometimes called the grotto of Agraulos. This is connected by a further underground passage with the Acropolis. The upper entrance lies N.W. of the Erechtheum in the walls supposed to belong to the house of the Arrhephori.—Under the grotto of Apollo, close to the Acropolis rock, are the remains of a building of which the object is undetermined (*Ath. Mitth.* xxii. part 1). Several marble inscriptions have fallen into it from above. The most important one mentions a sanctuary which was to be provided with a new door, and in which the well-known architect Kallikrates was to erect a temple and altar. This must be the little temple of Athena Nike. As the inscription still uses the three-stroke sigma, the temple must have been begun in the middle of the fifth century, and was probably finished before the Propylaea.[2]

ASIA MINOR.

Priene.—The German excavators have made clear the whole plan of the new city, which arose in early Hellenistic times. The old city lay on and immediately below the acropolis, the two parts being connected by a fine staircase cut in the rock (see the view in *Arch. Anz.* p. 68). The extant ruins of the Temple of Athena, which stood on a spur lower down, belong to the building dedicated by Alexander. Below this the ground falls in terraces southwards to the plain. On one of these terraces, below the temple, lay the main street and agora, above which are the remains of the theatre (remarkable for the fine preservation of the stage buildings). The stadium was situated on the terrace below the agora, being limited on the south by the still fairly preserved city-wall. The distance of the site from the sea, which even in Strabo's time was forty stadia, is now doubled.[3]

SYRIA.

Nazareth.—A bronze tablet bearing a Latin inscription, which can be dated to 139 A.D., has been found near Nazareth. It is part of a military diploma, granted to Gaius, son of Lucius, a foot-soldier of the second (Ulpian) cohort of the Galatians, and a native of Nicaea (probably the Bithynian city). The importance of the inscription is that it mentions the *consules suffecti* for the year (viz. M. Ceccius Justinus and G. Julius Bassus), and also P. Calpurnius Atilianus, governor of *Syria-Palaestina*, as the province of Judaea was then called. Two *alae* of cavalry and seven cohorts are here mentioned for the first time.[4]

AFRICA.

Carthage.—In the arena of the amphitheatre a subterranean chamber has been opened up, the rubbish in which contained a number of small antiquities. Among these were 55 thin leaden plates, rolled up and bearing incised inscriptions in Greek or Latin. The only one at present deciphered contains an imprecation in 28 lines against a child *Maurussus, quem peperit Felicitas.* The arena has been almost entirely cleared; among the finds is a torso of Diana, measuring in its present condition 0·265 metre in height. The goddess is moving to the right, wears a short sleeveless chiton and mantle (the right breast being left bare), and carries a quiver at her shoulder.[5]

G. F. Hill.

[1] *Athenaeum*, 11 Sept.

[2] *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 11 Sept. For the question as to the way by which the Arrhephori descended from the Acropolis and the Persians ascended to it, see 25 Sept. and 2 Oct.

[3] *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 28 Aug.

[4] Acad. des Inscr., *Comptes Rendus*, Mai-Juin, p. 333 ff.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 319.

Numismatic Chronicle. Part i. 1896.

E. J. Seltmann. 'Supposed signs of value on early coins of Himera.' Suggests that these 'signs' are letters of the word λύτρον interpreted as 'ransom' or 'expiatory offering.' It should be borne in mind, however, that only the letters ΛV or perhaps ΛVT occur on the coins, and the reading even of these is not quite certain. G. F. Hill. 'Oinoanda: a new Greek mint.' On an interesting didrachm in the British Museum, the only known coin of this Lycian city. J. P. Lambros. 'On a coin of Hierapytna in Crete, hitherto wrongly attributed.' H. Montagu. 'Rare and unpublished Roman gold coins in my collection.' This paper was written by Mr. Montagu shortly before his death. The specimens referred to have now been sold by auction together with the rest of the Montagu collection of Roman gold coins.

Part ii. 1897.

W. Wroth. 'Greek coins acquired by the British Museum in 1896.' A description chiefly of the fine coins acquired at the Montagu and Bunbury sales. (With four plates). W. C. Boyd. 'A find of Roman denarii near Cambridge.' 193 coins, Clodius Albinus to Philip II. E. Whymper. 'A discovery of Roman coins on the summit of the Théodule Pass (Matterjoch).' Imperial coins of the third and fourth centuries.

Revue Numismatique. Part ii. 1897.

Th. Reinach. 'Apollon Derronaios.' On a new coin of Lycceius, king of Paeonia, with *obverse* head of Apollo inscribed ΔΕΡΡΩΝΑΙΟΣ. A people named Δέρρωνες are already known from coins. Reinach is led by this coin to believe that they lived near the borders of Paeonia. R. Mowat. 'Combinaisons secrètes de lettres dans les marques monétaires de l'Empire romain.' (*Continued*). *Chronique.* 'Discours de M. E. Babelon, sur l'utilité scientifique des collections de monnaies anciennes.' Review of Grenfell's *Revenue laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus*, by E. Babelon.

Revue suisse de Numismatique. Vol. vii.

Imhoof-Blumer. 'Zur Münzkunde Kleinasiens' (part iv.). On the coinage of Thyateira, Tralles and other Lydian towns. Representations of the Hero *Tyrimnos* on coins of Thyateira are discussed. He holds the Apolline laurel-branch, and the double-axe, and is sometimes represented as a horseman. Remarkable types of Hephaistos standing, and of Heliosian chariot drawn by *lions* appear on Pl. ii. 1; i. 18.

W. Wroth.

The Classical Review

DECEMBER 1897.

NOTES ON THE NEWLY-DISCOVERED FRAGMENT OF MENANDER'S Γεωργός.

PAGE 1 (recto).

l. 14. Perhaps *πῶς ἐρᾷς οὐδὲν φράσας.*

l. 18. The interrogation which M. Nicole introduces after *ἀδελφόν* is hardly probable. It is the common construction with *οἶδα.*

οὐκ οἶδα γὰρ τὸν ἀδελφὸν εἰ νῦν ἐξ ἀγροῦ
ἐνθάδ' ἐπιδημεῖ.

nescio enim num frater nunc ex rure regressus hic uersetur.

l. 24. Perhaps *κἀν οἷς δ' ἐγὼ νῦν εἰμι.*

Page 2 (verso).

l. 14. *κἄκλαιον ἅπαντες.* It would be natural for the servants to weep under the circumstances of a possibly fatal accident: and this seems to support M. Nicole's *other* conjecture *ἐκεῖσ' ἐκεῖνος* 'Il part pour l'autre monde.'

l. 17. I think the words *πάνυ φαύλως ἔχει are* the *παραμυθία,* tried to console him,' 'it's getting quite well': if so *ὦ* should be omitted.

l. 19 to 24. I offer the following:—

εὖ δ' ἦν οὗτος εἰ
ζωὴν ἁβρὰν παρ' αὑτὸν ἔνδον καὶ σχολὴν
ἡσπάζετ' ἀπαλλαγεὶς δικέλλης καὶ κακῶν.
ἀλλ' οὖν τίς ἐστι σκληρὸς ὁ γέρων τῷ βίῳ·
τοῦ μειρακίου τὰ πράγματ' ἀνακρόνει. Β. τινα
δρῶν; οὐχὶ παντάπασιν ἀγνοῶν; Α. ἴσως.

Page 3 (recto).

l. 1. Nicole seems right in his reading of this line, except perhaps that the word missing at the end is not *νῦν,* but *τόν*; l. 2 would thus begin with *ἀλαζόν',* another of M. Nicole's happier guesses. *καλέσασα* I should construct with *ἔξω,* 'summoning y name to come out.'

ll. 3, 4. I suggest

ἐμοί γε, Φίλιννα, χαιρέτω. τί χαιρέτω;
οἰμωζέτω μὲν οὖν, τοιοῦτος ὢν γαμεῖν.

'Quantum ad me, Philinna, uiuat ualeatque. Quod "ualeatque" dixi,' immo pessum eat, qui talem se praebeat in nuptiis, h.e. tam peruersum.

ll. 10–13. This passage is very interesting, representing as it does a different recension from that presented by Stobaeus Floril. 57, 5 in this form:

10 *ἀγρὸν εὐσεβέστερον γεωργεῖν οὐδένα*
11 *οἶμαι· φέρει γὰρ ὅσα θεοῖς ἄνθη καλά,*
12 *κιττόν, δάφνην· κριθὰς δ' ἐὰν σπείρω, πάνυ*
13 *δίκαιος ὢν ἀπέδωχ' ὅσας ἂν καταβάλω.*

Of these, the remains of l. 10 in the newly-discovered papyrus seem to show that it was identical. Not so with the other three. They stand thus in the papyrus:

οιμαιφερειγαρμυρ ρ . . . . . καλων
ανθητοσαυτατταλλα δ . . . . . η
απεδοκενορθωσκαιδικαιωσον . . . . ν.

This, one would suppose, might naturally be, as M. Nicole suggests,

οἶμαι· φέρει γὰρ μυρρίνην κιττὸν καλόν,
ἄνθη τοσαῦτα· τἄλλα δ' ἂν τις καταβάλῃ,
ἀπέδωκεν ὀρθῶς καὶ δικαίως οὐ πλέον,
ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τὸ μέτρον.

In these restitutions I see nothing to alter except possibly μυρρίνας, and κίσθον or κίστον for κιττόν. Ivy *might*, of course, be planted side by side and rank with myrtle :[1] yet it would be more natural to sow a sweet-smelling plant like the κίσθος, just as the comic poet Mnesimachus mentions this latter with mint, storax and a variety of other flowers whose ὀσμὴ σεμνὴ μυκτῆρα δονεῖ (fr. 4, v. 63 in vol. ii. of Kock's *Fragm. Comicorum*). The supplement of l. 13 M. Nicole draws from a fragment preserved by the scholiast on Aristides 541, 30, Dindorf (899 K.). I believe most critics will prefer M. Nicole's supplements as given above to the different version which he prints in his complete text p. 69.

l. 15. πάνθ' ὅσ' ἀναφέρομεν is possible, ἀν- having fallen out. The papyrus gives πανταοσαφερομεν.

ll. 17, 18. If the papyrus is right in giving in 18 οὕνεκ' ἐθεώρουν γεν[ν]ικὰ καὶ κοσμία (duals), it would seem that *two* women are addressed in 17. I cannot see how M. Nicole's γεννικά τε καὶ κόσμια can mean 'à toi pour qui je faisais de beaux et nobles rêves.' But on the other hand it is difficult to find a vocative which will at once fit into the line, *e.g. Scythi, Lychni,*

ωχαιρεπολλαμυρριηνυκαισυγ

and correspond with the letters νυ, themselves, M. Nicole states, p. 70, a correction of νη.

l. 19. This v. in the papyrus has a syllable too much :

μᾶλλον δὲ πράξεων ἐσομένων ἐὰν οἱ θεοι.

The order of the words μᾶλλον δὲ πρ. ἐσομένων looks right, and would be spoilt by an inversion like ἐσομένων πράξ. It might seem therefore that the article before θεοὶ should be omitted, and ἂν (or possibly ἤν) be written for ἐάν.

Page 4 (verso).

l. 14. ἥ τ' ἐρημία.

l. 16. Perhaps omit γε.

The new fragment must, I fear, be considered, at present, to require a large amount of extra elucidation; much of the first editor's conjectural restoration is more than doubtful.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

Page 1 (recto), l. 14. The line probably ended

ἑσπ]έρας οὐδὲν φράσας,

the meaning being something like 'I will stay away till evening.'

l. 19. με δεῖ, not μ' ἔδει.

Page 2 (verso), l. 19. οὗτος εἶ. οὐτοσί?

Page 3 (recto), l. 4. τὸ[ν ο]ὕτω σῶν γαμεῖν!

Rather τὸ [δ' ο]ὕτω.

Page 4 (verso), l. 12. ἔ]ξειν. No, ἥ]ξειν.

l. 14. ἥ τ' ἐρημία.

A. PLATT.

THE MINOR WORKS OF XENOPHON.

(*Continued from page* 339.)

IX. THE WAYS AND MEANS.

THE genuineness of the Πόροι (*Ways and Means*), as a work of Xenophon, has been denied or doubted, sometimes on the ground of the date assumed for it, sometimes because it praises peace and does not praise agriculture, or for similar reasons. Into these questions I do not propose to enter, though I will say something presently as to the form of the work, in which some critics discover a speech, or even two speeches, addressed to the popular assembly. I will first examine whether there is anything in it that belongs noticeably to the vocabulary or manner of Xenophon. As its unity has been impugned, it will be best to take things in order as they come.

Προστάτης in its legal sense and προστάτης τοῦ δήμου are not noteworthy, but in a wider use προστάτης (τῆς πόλεως, etc.) is not very common in political writers, never for instance occurring in Thucydides nor in the *Politics*, though the Ἀθ. Πολ. has it in 22, 4. X. however has it several times, and such is its use in the first sentence of this treatise, ὁποῖοί τινες ἂν οἱ πρόσταται ὦσι, τοιαύτας καὶ τὰς πολιτείας γίγνεσθαι. It recurs (προστάται τοῦ ναυτικοῦ) in 5, 6 and in the same place we have προστατεύειν a verb

[1] So, seemingly, in Alciphron, 3, 17, and the passage of Lucian cited on p. 35: but the corruptions of Menander's text might easily have set in before the age of either Lucian or Alciphron.

which, though frequent in X., seems to be used by no other Attic author. The poets, Plato, and X. occasionally have προστατεῖν. The temporal use of ἐπεί = *after, since* (1, 1 : 5, 6 *bis* and 12; perhaps the first instance is doubtful) we have seen before to be frequent in Thucydides and X., not in common Attic prose, which prefers ἐπειδή. Πῃ (1, 1) is Xn. Διατρέφω (1, 1 : διατροφή 4, 49), rare elsewhere, occurs in X. four or five times. The use of ἐπικουρῶ in 1, 1 (νομίζω...ἅμα τῇ τε πενίᾳ αὐτῶν ἐπικεκουρῆσθαι ἂν καὶ τῷ ὑπόπτους τοῖς Ἕλλησιν εἶναι) reminds us not only of the doubtful *R. L.* 2, 6 τῷ λιμῷ ἐπικουροῦντας, but also of *Mem.* 1, 4, 13 νόσοις ἐπικουρῆσαι and *Anab.* 4, 5, 13 ἐπικούρημα τῆς χιόνος. In all these places it will be seen that there is a notion of something to be guarded against. Ἀναφαίνομαι (1, 2 : 4, 4) is a favourite word with X. Πρῳαίτατα and ὀψιαίτατα are words sufficiently uncommon for us to notice that their antithesis (1, 3 π. μὲν ἄρχεται, ὀ. δὲ λήγει) is found also in *Hell.* 4, 5, 18 and in the disputed *Cyr.* 8, 8, 9. Λήγω (*ibid.*) is a word of extreme rarity in most Attic prose. Demosthenes has it once (24, 98) in what was no doubt a traditional phrase (περὶ λήγοντα τὸν ἐνιαυτόν. Cf. Thuc. 5, 81, 2 τοῦ χειμῶνος λήγοντος, one of the two places in which Thucydides uses the word, and λήγοντος τοῦ χειμῶνος, τοῦ θέρους Ar. *Hist. An.* 5, 12, 544 *a* 16; 28, 555 *b* 30). Of the speeches ascribed to Lysias the very doubtful ἐπιτάφιος is the only one that has it (§ 74 λῆξαι τῆς λύπης) and that speech has also such words as κλέος and πενθεῖν. Aristophanes seems to have it only in the *Peace* (332, 1076, 1328), and in two of the three passages the language is not that of prose at all. On the other hand X. and Plato use it freely, and I ought to have pointed to its use in *Agesilaus* 2, 14 and 20 : 11, 2 as a repeated Xn. touch. Ἀμφί, in the use of which X. stands alone among good Attic prose-writers, occurs in this treatise in three different ways(1, 6 ἀμφὶ τὰ μέσα ᾠκίσθαι : 4, 8 ἀμφὶ ὅπλα...δαπανᾶν (cf. *Anab.* 1, 1, 8) : 4, 43 ἀπέχει...ἀμφὶ τὰ ἑξήκοντα στάδια). Περίρρυτος (1, 7) and ἀμφιθάλαττος (*ibid.*) are just such semi-poetical words as occur abundantly in X.

Αὐτοφυής (2, 1 : 4, 2 cf. *De Re Eq.* 7, 11) is one of the terms we find in Thucydides, X., Plato, Aristotle, not in the orators or the ordinary language of comedy (once in a poetical fragment of Aristophanes, containing such a word as χθονός). The strengthened ἐπείπερ (2, 1) is very rare in oratory, very common in Plato, occasional in X. (*Oec.* 1, 11 : *Hipparch.* 8, 4, etc.). Ἀλλοδαπός (2, 4) is a word of poetry, unknown not only to oratory and comedy, but also to Thucydides, and even to Plato : X. has it *Cyr.* 8, 7, 14 (*Mem.* 4, 3, 8 is probably spurious). Six times in this treatise (2, 6 : 3, 3 : 4, 9, 41, 47, 52) we find πολύ with a comparative (πολὺ πλείους, πολὺ μᾶλλον etc.), not once I think πολλῷ. Holden's index to the *Oeconomicus* shows that there πολύ with a comparative occurs ten times, πολλῷ once; and X. seems generally to prefer πολύ. Κερδαλέος is rare in prose. It occurs not at all in Lysias and Demosthenes, twice in Thucydides, two or three times in Isocrates, occasionally in Plato. X. has it a dozen times (including *Ages.* 11, 3) and it occurs here in 3, 1 and 5, 11. Ἀμφίλογος (3, 3) will not, I think, easily be found in any good prose writer save X. (two or three times), Thucydides (twice), Aristotle (once?). The same sentence gives us in ὡς μὴ κωλύεσθαι ἀποπλεῖν τὸν βουλόμενον X.'s very characteristic use of ὡς = ὥστε, which is almost or quite unknown to other Attic writers of prose. It occurs again in 4, 35. On the other hand X.'s final ὡς with subjunctive or optative is not found in this book. Ὅπως occurs four or five times : ἵνα according to Weber's figures four times, but in reality I think once (4, 13) in the stereotyped phrase ἵνα...εἴπω, where perhaps ὅπως and ὡς were hardly admissible, and once (6, 1) otherwise. Weber lays it down that in X. as a whole ἵνα and ὅπως are equally balanced, but that ὅπως preponderates in his later years. Ἔστιν ὅτε (3, 4) and ἔστιν ἅς (3, 11) agree with X.'s preference of such forms to ἐνίοτε and ἔνιοι. The only other passage cited for ἐμπόρευμα (3, 4) is *Hiero* 9, 11. Ἐπισπεύδειν (3, 4 ὡς πρὸς φίλους ἐπισπεύδοιεν ἄν) will be found in *Hell.* 5, 1, 33 : *Symp.* 7, 4, and δύσελπις (3, 7), a rare word, in *Hell.* 5, 4, 31. The construction δύσελπις τὸ μὴ οὐχὶ προθύμως ἂν...εἰσφέρειν has parallels in X., as may be seen from Sauppe's *Lexilogus* p. 69 *b*. In speaking of the *Agesilaus* I noticed that X. not only uses σύν where pure Attic has μετά, but likes to combine it with words that yield a sort of adverbial phrase. Such expressions are σὺν τῇ βίᾳ *Cyr.* 8, 7, 13 : σὺν τῷ πατρίῳ φρονήματι ἰέναι (*Anab.* 3, 2, 16). So here in 3, 8 we have σὺν πολλῇ δαπάνῃ, whereas Plato once or twice writes μετὰ δαπάνης. Σὺν θεῷ in 6, 3 is not a noticeable Xn. use, being an old consecrated phrase that survives in all authors the encroachments of μετά. Προτελεῖν (3, 9 and 10) occurs not only *Ages.* 1, 18, but also *Anab.* 7, 7, 25, hardly elsewhere in good Attic literature.

Ἐγγύς with numbers (3, 10 ἐγγὺς δυοῖν μναῖν) is Xn. (e.g. *Hipparch.* 1, 19) and πολυχρόνιος (*ibid.*) will be found *Mem.* 1, 4, 16.

The passive ἐπιχειρεῖσθαι (4, 2) occurs *Cyr.* 6, 1, 41. We have seen before X.'s fondness for the unattic μείων = ἧττων: it occurs three times (3, 23, 50) in this chapter. Such a use of λογίζομαι as (4, 5) ζημίαν λογίζονται, 'they count it a loss,' is uncommon but occurs *Cyr.* 1, 2, 11 μίαν ἄμφω τούτω τῶ ἡμέρα λογίζονται. Ἐνδεῖσθαι (*ibid.*) is a rare middle, used several times by X. Ὡσαύτως (4, 6) we have seen before to be used freely by X. and Plato, very little by the orators. In 4, 8 ἰσχυρῶς ἀργυρίου δέονται and 4, 50 ἰσχυρῶς...πολυάνθρωπος we recognise the ἰσχυρῶς = πάνυ, σφόδρα, etc., which is so distinctive a mark of X. The poetical δυσεύρετος (4, 13: cf. δύσελπις above) is used in *Mem.* 3, 14, 7. More significant is the poetical and Ionic τὰ παροιχόμενα (*ibid.*), which X. employs *Anab.* 2, 4, 1: *Hell.* I, 4, 17. Πλουτίζω (4, 14) is not quoted by Liddell and Scott from any other prose author, nor have I found it in anything more like good prose than one fragment of the comic poet Timocles: but X. has it half-a-dozen times without reckoning *Ages.* 1, 17: 4, 6. Ἀέναος (4, 17) and εὔδηλος (4, 18) are uncommon words used by X. Μηδὲ τοῦτο φοβεῖσθε, ὡς κ.τ.λ. (4, 32) is a construction that occurs *Cyr.* 5, 2, 12: 6, 2, 30, facilitated by τοῦτο. Τόσος (*ibid.* not certain) is a form not much used by X., but it occurs now and then, if MSS. may be trusted, e.g. *Cyr.* 1, 6, 26. The ὡς ἄν with optative in 4, 33 can perhaps hardly be called a characteristic instance of the Xn. use (Goodwin *M.* and *T.* Append. iv.). The rather remarkable expression ἐν ὠφελείᾳ (4, 35), 'yielding a profit' is employed *Cyr.* 8, 5, 15 ὅπου μάλιστα ἐν ὠφελείᾳ ἄν εἴη. Cf. ἐν ἡδονῇ εἶναι (Thucydides and Herodotus). I doubt whether ἔρυμα (4, 44) occurs in any orator: often in X. and Thucydides. X. is the only good writer from whom the comparative or superlative of πλησίος (πλησιαίτατα 4, 46: so twice in *Anab.*) is quoted, and ἡ ἐγγύτατα, ἡ πλησιαίτατα πόλις are expressions in accordance with Xn. usage. Αὐξάνω is the only form ordinarily used in Attic prose, but X. like the poets occasionally makes use of αὔξω, and we find it here 4, 49: 5, 2. Χῶροι (4, 50) = the more common ἀγροί of 4, 5 occurs several times in most writers: so too εὐπόλεμος and εὐπειθής (4, 51) occur in him, the former once (*Oec.* 4, 3) and the latter a good many times.

In 5, 1 ἔκπλεῳ is Cobet's certain correction, adopted by Dindorf and Zurborg, for the unmeaning ἐκ πόλεως. Now ἔκπλεως occurs almost a dozen times in X. and hardly, if at all, anywhere else in good prose. Προσφιλής is a word not used in comedy or oratory: it is found twice in *Oec.* and twice here (5, 1: 6, 1). Καταπράττω (5, 5) is quite a favourite word with X. The infinitive as immediate object of δίδωμι (5, 7 ἡγεμονεύειν αὐτῶν ἔδωκαν Ἀθηναίοις: so too perhaps in 2, 6) is many times paralleled in *Cyr.* (L. and S. omit this use or confuse it). The use of ἀνακτᾶσθαι for 'gaining the good will of' so-and-so, which is uncommon but occurs three or four times in *Cyr.*, is found here in 5, 8 (ἀνακτᾶσθαι τοὺς Ἕλληνας). In 5, 9 we may observe the πρόσθεν which X. prefers to ἔμπροσθεν (see however 4, 28). We have noticed before his use of ἀνά (ἀνὰ τὰ ὄρη, τὰ πεδία, etc.) where Attic has κατά: observe now in 5, 9 ἀνὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα and in 5, 10 ἀνὰ πᾶσαν γῆν καὶ θάλατταν. The adverbial τὸ παλαιόν 'in old times' of 5, 12 is found in *Anab.*, *Hell.*, *Cyr.*: καταδαπανᾶν (*ibid.*) in *Anab.* and *Cyr.* In 6, 1 we notice εὐκλεής, a word quite uncommon in prose, never used by Demosthenes or Lysias (unless the Funeral Speech is his, and even then the speech is exceptional: see above), probably once (?) by Isocrates, but occurring in X. certainly three or four times, exclusive of *Ages.* 10, 3 and 4. Ἐγχειρεῖν (6, 1) is often used by X. as a variation on ἐπιχειρεῖν, and συναινεῖν (6, 3) which is very rare (Herodotus and Plato, apparently once each) occurs in X. quite half-a-dozen times, mostly in *Cyr.*

If we ask about the use of particles, we shall find that it is thoroughly Xn. in character. Especially noticeable perhaps is the use of καὶ—δέ, which is always a favourite with X.; καὶ—γε also occurs here frequently: cf. the index to Holden's *Oec.* s.v. Μήν with its various attendants (καὶ μήν, ἀλλὰ μήν, γε μήν, οὐδὲ μήν) is incessant. In 4, 40 we have a δέ in the apodosis (εἰ δ' αὖ... νομίζετ' ἂν μηδοτιοῦν δύνασθαι εἰσενεγκεῖν, ὑμεῖς δέ...διοικεῖτε τὴν πόλιν) which closely resembles *Cyr.* 5, 5, 21 ἀλλ' εἰ μηδὲ τοῦτο βούλει ἀποκρίνασθαι, σὺ δὲ τοὐντεῦθεν λέγε. Anaphora with μέν and δέ is a marked feature of X's writing, and of this treatise: see for instance 2, 2 εἰ ἀφέλοιμεν μέν...ἀφέλοιμεν δέ...· μέγας μὲν γάρ...,μέγα δέ καὶ κ.τ.λ. The use of τε to connect a sentence with the sentence preceding belongs to Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon and Aristotle among prose writers, but is seldom found in the orators or Plato (Kühner § 519). I have noticed it twice here (1, 6 and 4, 9) and it may occur elsewhere. The double τε, which is

also by no means common in prose, but sometimes used by X., occurs in 4, 52. Ἀτάρ is a particle used freely only by Plato and X., not in the orators: it is found in 4, 16.

As in X's undoubted works, no care is taken to avoid hiatus.

Looking for evidence on the other side, I cannot find anything in the Greek to throw doubt on X.'s authorship. A few questionable expressions there are, but, even if not due to error, they are of no use for our enquiry. We have therefore a considerable number of things in the vocabulary that point to X. very clearly, and nothing whatever (so far as I know) that goes against him. Apart from the details of vocabulary, many turns of thought and expression suggest X. to me, but I lay no stress here upon a somewhat indefinite feeling, the grounds for which are not always clear to oneself and cannot easily be conveyed to others. As to the matter and contents of the little book, they seem to me perfectly consistent with the tradition of X. being the writer, though there is perhaps nothing in them except one small touch, which would actually suggest him. The passage is one to which other critics have drawn attention. After laying his schemes before the Athenians, he adds a hope that in the event of their approval they will before acting on his advice consult the oracles of Dodona and Delphi. This pious precaution is thoroughly in keeping with the feeling and practice of X. Compare for instance *Hipparch.* 9, 8 *ταῦτα* (the admission of aliens to the cavalry) *δὲ πάντα θεῶν συνεθελόντων γένοιτ' ἄν. εἰ δέ τις τοῦτο θαυμάζει ὅτι πολλάκις γέγραπται τὸ σὺν θεῷ πράττειν, εὖ ἴστω ὅτι ἦν πολλάκις κινδυνεύῃ ἧττον τοῦτο θαυμάσεται κ.τ.λ.* But it would not so readily have occurred to everyone that for a more energetic working of the silver mines in the public interest Apollo's sanction ought to be previously obtained.

Hagen has maintained (see Sauppe's preface) that the book is made up of two speeches actually delivered to the people by different speakers, neither of whom was X. I have shown how well the language tallies in every chapter with the usages of X., and how widely it differs from the ordinary diction of Attic orators. The theory of two speakers rests on alleged inconsistencies in different passages: they do not seem to me serious. The reason for supposing the work to be a speech is, no doubt, the repeated use in the latter part of it of the second person plural, when the author is addressing himself to the Athenians. This use does not appear I think, in the first three chapters. It begins with 4. 1 (*ἄμεινον ἂν βουλεύοισθε*) and recurs several times (4. 32, 40 : 5. 9, 10 : 6. 2). But that this method of expression does not necessarily imply a public speech may be seen from the fact that it occurs in the *Hipparchicus*, which is certainly not of that nature. X. writes there 3. 12 *χρή...ἐπὶ φάλαγγος ἅπαντας καταστάντας ὥσπερ εἰώθατε, πρὸς τὴν βουλὴν προσελαύνειν*, and again 4. 3–5 *ὅταν...ἀφικνῆσθε,...ὅταν ἔξω τῶν ὁδῶν διὰ δυσχωρίας ἐλαύνητε...ἢν δ' ἐπὶ κίνδυνον ἐλαύνητε, κ.τ.λ.*, addressing himself, but only in imagination, to the hipparch and his men, just as a minute before (4. 3) he addresses himself to the hipparch alone in *ἢν μέν γε... ἐλαύνῃς..., ἢν δὲ ἐπιτυγχάνῃς*, on which follows in two lines the *ὅταν ἀφικνῆσθε*. We observed the same thing in the *Respublica Atheniensium* (3. 5 *οὐκ οἴεσθε χρῆναι*) which no one has taken to be a speech. In the work before us there is no *ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι* or anything similar, nor any even of the make-believe resorted to by Isocrates, and I see no reason for supposing that it was anything but a written composition intended to be read.

It is remarkable that Xenophon, if he is the author, dates his composition, so to speak, from Athens. He refers to Athens as 'here' (*ἐνθάδε* 1. 3; contrast the use of *αὐτόθι* in *R.A.* Ἐνθάδε can no more mean 'there' (Liddell and Scott) than *αὐτόθι* can mean 'here'), and habitually by saying 'we' includes himself among the people who are to do this or that. There seems no external evidence to show that X. ever returned to Athens in his later years; and, if he did not, we may be surprised at the interest he takes after so long an absence in the augmentation of Athenian revenues. The 'we' will have to be put down as an artifice of style.

The best critical edition of the *Ways and Means* is that of Zurborg (Berlin 1876). In 1874 Mr. Zurborg published a *Dissertatio* (*De Xenophontis libello qui* Πόροι *inscribitur*), in which he defends the Xn. authorship, partly on grounds of style. What he has to say on the style is almost entirely different from the points which I have brought out above. His remarks seem to me true and valuable, but except in one or two trifling details they in no way anticipate mine.

2. 1. X. proposes that the metics be not compelled to serve as hoplites: *μέγας μὲν γὰρ ὁ κίνδυνος ἀπών* (so most MSS. One

which has sometimes good readings *ἀπόντι.*) *μέγα δὲ καὶ τὸ ἀπὸ τῶν τεχνῶν* (MSS. *τέκνων*) *καὶ τῶν οἰκείων ἀπεῖναι* (MSS. *ἀπιέναι*). *ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ ἡ πόλις ἂν ὠφεληθείη, εἰ οἱ πολῖται μετ' ἀλλήλων στρατεύοιντο μᾶλλον ἢ εἰ συντάττοιντο αὐτοῖς ὥσπερ νῦν Λυδοὶ καὶ Φρύγες καὶ Σύροι καὶ ἄλλοι παντοδαποὶ βάρβαροι.*

Zurborg after Kaibel reads *μέγας μὲν γὰρ ὁ ἀγών*, the theory being that *ἀπών* is an error for *ἀγών*, on which *κίνδυνος* was a gloss. This is somewhat complicated, and *ἀγών* is a rhetorical expression quite out of place here. The older conjecture *αὐτῶν*, though not convincing, seems really better, and *αὐτῶν* may by contrast be emphatic. Cobet's *ἀπεῖναι* for *ἀπιέναι* is the reverse change to that I have suggested (*ἰέναι* for *εἶναι*) in *Ages.* 1. 28. If in the second sentence the expression is strictly accurate, *μᾶλλον* must be taken with *ὠφεληθείη*, and then we should change the punctuation given by the editors as above, and put a comma after *στρατεύοιντο.*

3. 5. *τοσούτῳ ἂν πλεῖον καὶ εἰσάγοιτο καὶ ἐξάγοιτο καὶ μισθοφοροῖτο καὶ τελεσφοροίη.*

Read *τελεσφοροῖτο*, as symmetry and sense require: 'would be paid in salary (*μισθός*) and in dues.' Cf. 4. 35 below.

3. 8. *καὶ ταύτας γενομένας* is clearly wrong, but Schneider's *ταῦτα γενόμενα* (or perhaps *γιγνόμενα*) seems better than Z.'s *καὶ ταῦτα* simply as in 10. It would be hard to account for the interpolation of the participle. I understand *καὶ τ. γ.* to refer not only to the *τριήρεις ἐκπεμπομένας*, but to the *πολλὰ εἰσήνεγκε κ.τ.λ.* preceding, as *ἀπολήψονται ἃ ἂν εἰσενέγκωσι* shows, and this makes the addition of *γενόμενα* or *γιγνόμενα* by the author actually necessary.

These sacrifices were made (he says) though it was clear *ὅτι οὐδέποτε ἀπολήψονται ἃ ἂν εἰσενέγκωσιν οὐδὲ μεθέξουσιν ὧν ἂν εἰσενέγκωσι.* The second *εἰσενέγκωσι* is a clear case of the accidental repetition of a neighbouring word through such a clerical error as we are all liable to, but it is not easy to be sure what word it has displaced. Madvig's *ἐξενέγκωσι*, also conjectured by Hartman, implies a misunderstanding of the passage. *Κερδάνωσι* has been suggested by Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, though subsequently he was satisfied with *ὧν ἂν <ἔνεκ'> εἰσενέγκωσι* which probably suggested to Z. his *<ὑπὲρ> ὧν ἂν εἰσενέγκωσι.* As X. is speaking of cases in which assistance and even costly assistance was given to other states, I should suggest something like *ὠφελήσωσι, διασώσωσι*, or *δαπανήσωσι*; but there is no possibility of fixing the exact word.

4, 13. *τὰ μὲν γὰρ ὧν λέξω καὶ νῦν ἔτι πάντες ὁρῶμεν, τὰ δὲ παροιχόμενα πάντων κατὰ ταὐτὰ αὖ ἀκούομεν.*

Wilamowitz' *παρὰ τῶν πατέρων* for *πάντων* is too bold a conjecture, though Z. admits it to the text. Perhaps *πάντα* is all we want.

4, 14. *τῆς μέντοι πόλεως πάνυ ἄξιον θαυμάσαι τὸ αἰσθανομένην πολλοὺς πλουτιζομένους ἐξ αὐτῆς ἰδιώτας μὴ μιμεῖσθαι τούτους. πάλαι μὲν γὰρ δήπου οἷς μεμέληκεν ἀκηκόαμεν ὅτι Νικίας κ.τ.λ.*

Οἷς *μεμέληκεν* seems not only strange in itself, but actually to vitiate or at least weaken the argument. If it was only those οἷς *μεμέληκεν* who knew these things, there was less wonder that the state failed to act upon the knowledge. The point is that these things were matters of common and universal report. I conjecture therefore that οἷς *μεμέληκεν* has by accidental omission and then mistaken insertion got out of its proper place and that it belongs to *ἰδιώτας* in the line before. Individuals who made it their business had grown wealthy on the mining industry.

4, 17. *εἰ...καὶ ἡ πόλις κτῷτο δημόσια ἀνδράποδα, ἕως γιγνοιτο τρία ἑκάστῳ Ἀθηναίων.*

I fail to see the meaning of the last words. The slaves were to be *δημόσια*, not the property of individuals; nor can it be the case, as editors seem to suppose, that every individual Athenian was to hire three public slaves to work the mines with. The proposals of the *Ways and Means* may not be very practicable, but the writer at any rate knew better than to think that the slaves in the mines could be divided into gangs of three and then looked after by their individual masters, those masters too being the whole number of free Athenian citizens. The scheme clearly assumes that large capitalists will own large gangs with the necessary overseers. The writer may have said, as Böckh understands him, that the state should buy slaves, till there were three for, that is in proportion to, every citizen. But can the Greek dative mean this?

4, 18. *τιμὴν μὲν ἀνθρώπων εὔδηλον ὅτι μᾶλλον ἂν τὸ δημόσιον δύναιτο ἢ οἱ ἰδιῶται παρασκευάσασθαι.*

Do we not need *<τοσούτων>* ἀνθρώπων, or *τῶν ἀνθρώπων* at the very least? It is not slaves, but such a number of slaves, that the state could afford better than individuals.

4, 26. *οὔκ ἄν ποτε πλείω ἀνδράποδα ἐκεῖ γένοιτο ἢ ὅσων ἂν τὰ ἔργα δέηται.*

This passage has perhaps been corrupted from § 39, *εἰ μὴ πλείονας ἀνθρώπους ἢ ὅσους*

αὐτὰ τὰ ἔργα προσαιτοίη κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἐμβάλοιμεν. There ὅσους makes good enough sense. They are not to employ more hands than whatever number the state of the works may require. But here the case is quite different. He is saying that the mines are practically unlimited and that you cannot employ too many men. Indeed the difference of the two passages has been made an argument for difference of authorship. What he ought to say then is 'you cannot employ more men than they need.' He must not say 'you cannot employ more men than whatever number they need,' for that in the context would be nonsense. But, when we look into the matter, we find that the MSS. actually have δεῖται, not δέηται, which is Heindorf's correction and a necessary one, if ὅσων ἄν were right. The sense seems to require that we shall omit ὅσων ἄν and read πλείω...ἢ τὰ ἔργα δεῖται; or possibly ἢ ὅσων τὰ ἔργα δεῖται might stand.

4, 35. ὁπόσ' ἂν ἢ οἰκοδομηθῇ ἢ ναυπηγηθῇ ἢ ἀνδράποδα ὠνηθῇ.

Though the verb is not found anywhere else, we need have no hesitation in reading ἀνδραποδωνηθῇ. Aristophanes has ἀνδραποδώνης and the verb must almost certainly have been in use. Cf. ὀψωνεῖν, σιτωνεῖν. The passive is not logically bolder than οἰκοδομηθῇ and ναυπηγηθῇ. Cf. the note on 3, 5 above, and Sallust *Cat.* 2, 7, *quae homines arant navigant aedificant, virtuti omnia parent.*

4, 37. κατά γε μὴν τὸ δυνατὸν περαίνοντες τὰ μὲν καλῶς γνωσθέντα καὶ αὖθις ἂν ἡμῖν οἰόμεθα· εἰ δέ τι ἁμαρτηθείη, ἀπεχοίμεθ' ἂν αὐτοῦ.

Οἰόμεθα most MSS., but two οἰοίμεθα. All but one ἀπεχθοίμεθα; but that one, which contains some good readings, or possibly conjectures, has the evidently right ἀπεχοίμεθα. Editors read αὖθις ἂν ἀνύτοιμεν (Dindorf): αὖθις ἂν ἡμῖν γενέσθαι οἰόμεθα (Sauppe after Hermann): αὖθις ἂν ἀνύτοιμεν with the mark of a considerable hiatus before οἰόμεθα (Zurborg). The last conjecture is quite gratuitous. It seems clear that we have only to insert one word to make perfect sense, not however γενέσθαι, but something like ποιητέα. We might read καὶ αὖθις ἂν ἡμῖν οἰοίμεθα <ποιητέα>. The optative οἰοίμεθα is clearly required by the sense and by the parallel verb ἀπεχοίμεθα.

4, 43. He propounds a scheme for saving the mines from being abandoned in time of war. There are already two walls or forts (τείχη) north and south, about seven and a half miles apart. Εἰ οὖν καὶ ἐν μέσῳ τούτων γένοιτο ἐπὶ τῷ ὑψηλοτάτῳ Βήσης τρίτον ἔρυμα, συνήκοι τ' ἂν τὰ ἔργα εἰς ἓν ἐξ ἁπάντων τῶν τειχῶν καὶ, εἴ τι αἰσθάνοιτο πολεμικόν, βραχὺ ἂν εἴη ἑκάστῳ εἰς τὸ ἀσφαλὲς ἀποχωρῆσαι.

Συνήκοι τ' ἂν κ.τ.λ. means literally that the galleries or shafts would have been made to meet in one from all the forts or walls. This is certainly obscure, but perhaps without undue forcing we may interpret it to mean, or at any rate to imply, that there would be free communication from any point in the mines with any one of the forts, and that therefore on alarm of an enemy's presence workmen could take refuge in whatever fort was most convenient. It must be a fort above ground to which they would resort, not some central spot in the mines, because (1) there would otherwise be no advantage in the new third fort: (2) indeed none of the forts would be of any use: (3) the enemy could desire nothing better than to be able to shut up all the workmen underground. Apparently the advantage of the new fort would be that it gave many men a shelter nearer at hand. At present the forts were seven or eight miles apart: now they would be three or four miles apart, and therefore a man would not have more than one and a half or two miles to go.

This may perhaps not be the meaning, but in that case it is hard to see that the words mean anything. Possibly, as has been suspected, the text is imperfect: there may be something missing. In any case the words cannot, I think, bear the meaning which Mr. Dakyns (see however his note) and apparently Dindorf give them, that the workmen might 'collect into one out of all the fortresses,' that is, collect from the fortresses to some one spot. Apart from the reasons given above and from the fact that, when the alarm was raised, the workmen would be in the mines, not in the fortresses, there are two other objections to this interpretation, on the second of which I will dwell a little, because it involves an important point of Greek.

First, there is no reason to think that ἔργα can mean the men, the ἐργάται. It is used three or four times in this treatise of the mines themselves, and no example of ἔργα = ἐργάται is adduced. Secondly, the 'perfect' meaning of ἥκω is disregarded in this translation, a meaning which the present tense never really loses either in the simple verb or in its compounds. There are no doubt cases in which some scholars, Liddell and Scott for instance, seem to lose sight of it, but it is always there. When an inscription διήκει a statue (*Herod.* 2, 106, 3), when a ridge of hill διήκει a tract of country (*ib.* 4, 185, 2), when parts of animals or plants

are described (Aristotle, Theophrastus) as *συνήκοντα*, we may translate the words well enough for ordinary purposes by *stretches* or *meeting*, but they really mean that man or nature *has* arranged, not *does* arrange things so. The inscription is not in the act of crossing, it has been made to cross—and now is across. *Διήκει* expresses the present state, not the present act. Observe Herodotus' account of the way in which Persian troops 'swept' an island (6, 31, 3): *ἀνὴρ ἀνδρὸς ἁψάμενος τῆς χειρὸς ἐκ θαλάσσης τῆς βορηίης ἐπὶ τὴν νοτίην διήκουσι καὶ ἔπειτα διὰ πάσης τῆς νήσου διέρχονται ἐκθηρεύοντες τοὺς ἀνθρώπους.* Here *διήκουσι* is not strictly 'stretch themselves out' (Stein, *dehnen sich aus*) as an act, but 'stand stretched out across the island.' They have already taken up the position when Herodotus begins to describe. When Aristotle, *Poet.* 1459 b 22, says that epics would be of the right size if they *παρήκοιεν* to the length of a certain number of tragedies, *εἰ παρήκοιεν* similarly expresses their supposed condition, 'if they had been made so as to be of a certain length.' It is strange how Prof. Jebb can still (edn. of 1896) translate Soph. *Aj.* 186 *ἥκοι γὰρ ἂν θεία νόσος*, 'if the gods send madness, it must come.' The words really mean 'heaven must (may) have afflicted him': literally, we should find (*ἄν* with optative) that a *θεία νόσος ἥκει*. So on *O.T.* 1182 *τὰ πάντ' ἂν ἐξήκοι σαφῆ* Mr. Jebb himself says in his note 'must have come true.' So on Ar. *Wasps* 277 *τάχ' ἂν βουβωνιῴη* 'perhaps (we should find) he is laid up': *Peace* 43 *οὐκοῦν ἂν ἥδη τῶν θεατῶν τις λέγοι*, 'may be saying' (cf. *φησί* in 46): Dem. 23, 30 *περὶ τῶν ἑαλωκότων ἂν λέγοι* 'he must be speaking about men convicted,' and *ib.* 45: Plato, *Phil.* 43 c. (in the same phrase as the *Ajax*) *πάλιν ὁ νῦν δὴ ῥηθεὶς βίος ἂν ἥκοι* 'would seem to have returned upon us.' Even in the metaphorical uses of *προσήκω* and *ἀνήκω* the proper meaning is distinctly traceable. It is only in the present infinitive *ἥκειν* and in the imperfect *ἧκον* that it is sometimes lost.

In X. therefore *συνήκοι ἄν* must describe some state of things that, when an enemy appeared on the scene, would already be in existence.

4, 48. *ἐπισιτίζεσθαί γε μὴν μέρει μὲν κίνδυνος καὶ περὶ τῶν μετιόντων καὶ περὶ ὧν ἀγωνίζονται· πάντες δὲ ἀεὶ μετιόντες πολιορκοῖντ' ἂν μᾶλλον ἢ πολιορκοῖεν.*

Z., supposing with Schneider that *περὶ ὧν ἀγωνίζονται* must stand, if right, for *περὶ τούτων οἷς ἀγωνίζονται*, suggests *περὶ τῶν ἀγωνιζομένων*. But I take it that the foragers are themselves the *ἀγωνιζόμενοι*. When they start to forage, they expect to fight. The words are therefore short for *περὶ τούτων περὶ ὧν ἀγωνίζονται*, where *ὧν* may be either neuter or masculine.

4, 51. *πραχθέντων γε μὴν ὧν εἴρηκα σύμφημι ἐγὼ οὐ μόνον ἂν χρήμασιν εὐπορωτέραν τὴν πόλιν εἶναι ἀλλὰ καὶ κ.τ.λ.*

Σύμφημι is meaningless where the proposa and the anticipation are put forward as entirely the writer's own. Read *φημί*. Does *συμ* represent *νῦν*?

4. 52. Greater wealth would produce greater efficiency: *οἵ τε γὰρ ταχθέντες γυμνάζεσθαι πολὺ ἂν ἐπιμελέστερον πράττοιεν ἐν τοῖς γυμνασίοις τὴν τροφὴν ἀπολαμβανόντες πλείω ἢ ἐν ταῖς λαμπάσι γυμνασιαρχούμενοι· οἵ τε φρουρεῖν κ.τ.λ.*

Editors and critics usually insert *τά* after *πράττειν* (which may be right: cf. *ταῦτα πράττοιεν* in the next sentence); they translate *ἤ than*, and sometimes think *γυμνασιαρχούμενοι* may be middle. I do not find any example of *γυμνασιαρχεῖν* or similar verbs (*τριηραρχεῖν*, *ταξιαρχεῖν*, etc.) in the middle, and the context surely makes it plain that men in training are meant. Ἤ *than* seems to yield no meaning. What would be the point of saying that with larger public revenues they would receive more pay than when training for the torch-race? The payment for that would rise along with the payment for other things. If *τά* is not necessary—and it can hardly be called so—we might perhaps interpret thus: they would do things more carefully, when being kept and trained under orders in the ordinary athletic exercises or the torch-race, if their keep or pay was raised. But I admit that the order of the words is against this.

5. 1. *πολὺ ἂν...προσφιλεστέραν καὶ πυκνοτέραν εἰσαφικνεῖσθαι πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ποιήσειε τὴν πόλιν.*

'A more agreeable and crowded city to visit' seems almost nonsense, to say nothing of the fact that *πυκνή* = *πολυάνθρωπος* is very questionable. The phrase cannot mean, as Z. thinks, *εἰς ἣν πυκνότερον ἀφικνοῦνται*, 'more agreeable and one which they visit oftener.' He mentions the indifferent conjectures *προσηνεστέραν*, *ποθεινοτέραν*, *πιθανωτέραν* (his own), and might have added Madvig's *εὐκτοτέραν*, which is not less indifferent. By the insertion of a few letters we shall get *πολὺ κοινοτέραν* (X.'s *πολύ* with a comparative: see above) or *πολυκοινοτέραν*, a word used in Ar. *Eth.* 1. 9, 1099 b 18: Soph. *Aj.* 1192. Cf. *Cyneg.* 13. 9 *οἱ δὲ φιλόσοφοι πᾶσι κοινοὶ καὶ φίλοι*: Plat. *Men.* 91 B *ἀποφήναντας αὐτοὺς κοινοὺς τῶν Ἑλλήνων τῷ βουλομένῳ μανθάνειν.*

5. 2. I do not know how to emend the corrupt words here, but Haupt's *παρασκοποῦσιν*, adopted by Z., must be wrong. It would mean the adoption of a wrong method of enquiry, not the coming to a false conclusion, and the latter is the meaning needed. Haupt's hypothesis is moreover too complicated.

5. 3. Along with people who trade in corn, wine, oil, and cattle, he mentions others, *οἱ δὲ γνώμῃ καὶ ἀργυρίῳ δυνάμενοι χρηματίζεσθαι*, men who trade in money. The old idea seems to have been that *γνώμῃ* and *ἀργυρίῳ* were coupled together. Z. rightly demurring to this reads *ἀπ' ἀργυρίου*. Is there any objection to the traditional text, if we take *γνώμῃ* separately?—by means of superior intelligence the men trade or make profit in and with money. I have also thought of *κἂν ἀργυρίῳ*. Γνώμη is mentioned (cf. 4. 22) because money-dealing requires more intelligence than trade in corn or cattle.

5. 8. *ἔστι μὲν γὰρ πειρᾶσθαι διαλλάττειν τὰς πολεμούσας πρὸς ἀλλήλας πόλεις, ἔστι δὲ συναλλάττειν εἴ τινες ἐν αὐταῖς στασιάζουσιν.*

I suspect X. wrote *ἐν αὑτοῖς*. Τινές are men, as elsewhere in this treatise (Z.'s *Dissertatio* p. 27), not states.

5. 12. *γνώσεται...τὰς εἰσελθούσας (προσόδους) εἰς παντοδαπὰ πολλὰ καταδαπανηθείσας.*

It is hardly likely that *πολλά* can be a gloss on *παντοδαπά*, as has been thought. Perhaps it stands for *πολλάκις*. Schneider *πολλὰ καὶ παντοδαπά*.

6. 2. *ἐπερέσθαι τοὺς θεοὺς εἰ λῷον καὶ ἄμεινον εἴη ἂν τῇ πόλει οὕτω κατασκευαζομένῃ.*

It is surprising that editors can omit the *ἄν*. Here and in the two parallel passages in *R.L.* 8. 5 (where see my note) it is absolutely necessary. The question is as to the future, whether something if done would be advantageous. You can of course say '*Is* it better to do so and so?', though the doing it is still future; but you can hardly say 'To us doing so and so *does*' (instead of *will*) 'advantage accrue?' So in Greek *ἄν* would not be necessary with the infinitive (*κατασκενάζεσθαι*), but is necessary with the participle. If it is right to omit *ἄν* here, why should it not be omitted in the next sentence, *ἐπερωτᾶν τίνας θεῶν προσποιούμενοι ταῦτα κάλλιστα καὶ ἄριστα πράττοιμεν ἄν*? The construction is just the same.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

[As regards 4. 52, I feel with Mr. Richards the difficulty in the order of the words, and venture to subjoin a suggestion of my own. Though I believe *γυμνασιαρχεῖται* to have a middle force in *Rep. Ath.* i. 13 ('gets the service performed'), it is clearly, as Mr. Richards says, passive here; and its meaning should be 'found, or provided for, by the gymnasiarchs,' just as *οἱ παῖδες ἄριστα χορηγοῦνται* means (as Liddell and Scott, *there* rightly, take it) 'the members of the chorus are well *found* by their choregus.'

But, to yield the required sense 'men in training in the ordinary athletic exercises, or in the torch race would do things more carefully if they were more liberally provided for' we need a second comparative, *ἄμεινον γυμνασιαρχούμενοι* (unless, which seems doubtful, it can be supplied from the preceding *πλείω*). But why should *ἄμεινον* have dropped out? May not the sentence have been originally a simpler one without the unnecessary antithesis of the two participles, and have run thus: *πολὺ ἂν ἐπιμελέστερον πράττοιεν ἐν τοῖς γυμνασίοις ἢ ἐν ταῖς λαμπάσιν ἄμεινον γυμνασιαρχούμενοι*, the words *τὴν τροφὴν πλείω ἀπολαμβάνοντες* being merely a gloss to explain *ἄμεινον γυμνασιαρχούμενοι*?

G. E. MARINDIN.

OVID'S *HEROIDES*

(*Continued from p.* 290).

XVI 35–40.

Te peto, quam pepigit lecto Venus aurea nostro:
te prius optaui quam mihi nota fores.
ante tuos animo uidi quam lumine uultus:
prima fuit uultus nuntia fama tui.
nec tamen est mirum si, sicut oporteat, arcu
missilibus telis eminus ictus amo.

Verse 38 is so given by P and G and most MSS: V (saec. xii) has 'prima *mihi* uultus'. The sense is poor, and the repetition of 'uultus', first plural, then singular, is poorer.

To all intents and purposes the verse has already been emended by Mr. Palmer: 'prima *mihi uulnus* nuntia fama *tulit*': see the metaphor of the next distich. But in writing *mihi* Mr. Palmer abandons better MSS for a worse, and in writing *tulit* he abandons all MSS: I would sooner follow them where they agree and desert them where they differ:

prima *tulit uulnus* nuntia fama tui.

'tui' depends on 'nuntia'. I suppose the archetype had

prima *tui* uultus nuntia fama tui,

and *fuit* and *mihi* are alternative corrections of this manifest error.

From 38 to 145 all good ancient MSS fail us and leave us to the mercies of the 15th century. Accordingly the very next verse is corrupt. *oporteat* is not even grammar; the *oportuit actum* or *oportet ab arcu* of Heinsius has no sufficient sense; Bentley rightly expels the couplet and proposes *Apollinis* for *oporteat*, but I think the original form of the interpolation can be recovered with less ado:

nec tamen est mirum si, *sic cum polleat arcus*,
missilibus telis eminus ictus amo.

Helen's beauty is a bow which discharges the arrows of love: no marvel the arrows fly so far when the bow is so potent. *sic cum* is corrupted to *sic ut* in Livy xxxviii 21 12 and I daresay elsewhere.

XVI 83, 84.

Dulce Venus risit 'nec te, Pari, munera tangant
utraque suspensi plena timoris' ait.

It is possible that *nec* should be altered to *neu*; but Bentley alters it to *ne*, which is quite wrong: the asyndeton 'risit, ait' is not to be endured. Loers explains correctly that *nec* is *et non* and that the conjunction belongs to 'ait' and the negative to 'tangant': Venus risit et ait 'non te munera tangant'. He gives two Ovidian examples of this license, Madvig Lat. gramm. § 458 obs. 2 adds a third, and Haupt opusc. iii p. 512 a fourth: it is a natural sequel to Ovid's favourite practice of appending to the first word of a quotation a *que* which belongs to the verb of speaking, as at met. iii 644 obstipui 'capiat' que 'aliquis moderamina' dixi. I will here give all the instances which I have noted down, marking the true construction by a grotesque employment of inverted commas.

Her. xvi 83 sq.

dulce Venus risit 'ne' c 'te, Pari, munera tangant
utraque suspensi plena timoris' ait.

xxi 221 sq.

si me nunc uideas, uisam prius esse negabis
'arte ne' c 'est' dices 'ista petenda mea'.

Met. v 414

agnouitque deam 'ne' c 'longius ibitis' inquit.

ix 131 sq.

excipit hunc Nessus, 'ne' que enim 'moriemur inulti'
secum ait.

i.e. etenim ait 'non moriemur inulti'.

x 568–570

instantem turbam uiolenta procorum
condicione fugat 'ne' c 'sum potiunda nisi' inquit
'uicta prius cursu'.

xi 134–137

Bacchus peccasse fatentem
restituit pactique fide data munera soluit
'ne' ue 'male optato maneas circumlitus auro,
uade' ait 'ad magnis uicinum Sardibus amnem'.

xi 263

tum demum ingemuit 'ne' que ait 'sine numine uincis'.

Fast. iv 597

Iuppiter hanc lenit factumque excusat amore
'ne' c 'gener est nobis ille pudendus' ait.

In her. xii 202 Ovid takes one step further, and not content with breaking up *neque* into

et '*non*' and *neue* into *et* '*ne*' he breaks up *quam* into *et* '*hanc*':

aureus ille aries uillo spectabilis alto
dos mea, qu 'am' dicam si tibi 'redde' neges.

i.e. aries est dos mea, et, si dicam tibi 'hanc redde', neges.

XVI 121–123.

Et soror, effusis ut erat, Cassandra, capillis,
cum uellent nostrae iam dare uela rates,
'quo ruis?' exclamat.

122 'illud *nostrae* friget hoc loco' says Heinsius. One of the very few MSS which contain these verses omits it. It seems pretty clear then that *uento* or *uentis* has been absorbed by *uellent*.

XVII 51, 52.

Et genus et proauos et regia nomina iactas.
clara satis domus haec nobilitate sua est.

'*et* genus' is in most MSS; a few have *quod* or *quid*; but what one expects is a particle indicating that Helen, having just demolished one of Paris' arguments, is now passing to another. Well, P has *ea*: that is *ed*, the remains of *sed*.

XVIII 65, 66.

Tu, dea, mortalem caelo delapsa petebas:
uera loqui liceat, quam sequor ipse, dea est.

The words are right; but here as so often elsewhere the sense is spoilt by the punctuation of editors with their inveterate habit of mistaking nominatives for vocatives. Write

tu dea mortalem caelo delapsa petebas.

XVIII 119–122.

Si qua fides uero est, ueniens huc esse natator,
cum redeo, uideor naufragus esse mihi.
hoc quoque si credis, ad te uia prona uidetur,
a te cum redeo, cliuus inertis aquae.

'If you believe me when I tell the truth,' says Leander, 'I assure you that in coming hither I seem to myself to be a swimmer, in returning, to be a shipwrecked man'. That one who is swimming seems to himself to be a swimmer is so very credible a statement that the preface 'si qua fides uero est' looks a trifle superfluous. But Leander apparently seems to himself to be a swimmer only when he is swimming 'huc', whatever that may mean: when he is swimming in the other direction he seems to himself to be not a swimmer but—a shipwrecked man. Then are swimmers never shipwrecked? are the shipwrecked never swimmers? why, Hero herself at xix 185 sq. remarks 'quod cupis, hoc nautae metuunt, Leandre, *natare*: | *exitus hic fractis puppibus esse solet*'! Of course they say that *natator* means one who swims for his own pleasure; but that is a pure fiction. And pray what is *huc*? to make sense it must mean 'to Sestos', yet how can it, when Leander is penning this letter at Abydos? And what diction is *cum redeo* 120, *a te cum redeo* 122! And what prosody is *credis ad*!

The author of this epistle simply wrote

si qua fides uero est, ad te uia prona uidetur,
a te cum redeo, cliuus inertis aquae.

An interpolator added

hoc quoque si credis, ueniens huc esse natator,
cum redeo, uideor naufragus esse mihi;

and the two couplets have exchanged their first hemistichs.

XVIII 187–194.

Aestus adhuc tamen est. quid, cum mihi laeserit aequor
Plias et Arctophylax Oleniumque pecus?
aut ego non noui quam sim temerarius, aut me
in freta non cautus tum quoque mittet amor.
neue putes id me, quod abest, promittere tempus,
pignora polliciti non tibi tarda dabo.

sit tumidum paucis etiam nunc noctibus aequor,
ire per inuitas experiemur aquas.

191 'promittere id tempus' signifies nothing. Punctuate

neue putes id me, quod abest, promittere, tempus,

that is 'ne putes me eam rem promittere, quia tempus abest'.

Out of the immense number of Ovid's hyperbata I have selected ten of the most astounding in Journ. Phil. vol. xviii p. 7; but here I will confine myself to the heroides. Let me premise that there are always two methods, and never more than two, of punctuating an hyperbaton correctly. The second way in which this couplet may be correctly punctuated is to omit all the commas, 'neue putes id me quod abest promittere tempus | pignora' cet. Any third method will be incorrect; and therefore some third method is usually adopted.

Hyperbata recognised by the editors or at any rate correctly represented by their punctuation will be found at xvi 122, 132, xx 63 sq. (here Mr Ehwald is wrong, but it may be merely a misprint), and xxi 121.

Examples where most editors are wrong but some critics have recognised and expressed the true construction are the following.

iii 19

si progressa forem, caperer ne nocte, timebam.

Thus Merkel Riese Sedlmayer and Palmer; so absurdly that Heinsius preferred to write *forte* for *nocte*. But Madvig, followed by Mr Ehwald, has restored the correct punctuation:

si progressa forem, caperer ne, nocte, timebam:

that is 'timebam ne, si nocte progressa forem, caperer'.

vii 143 sq.

Pergama uix tanto tibi erant repetenda labore,
Hectore si uiuo, quanta fuere, forent.

So Riese and Sedlmayer, without sense.

Hectore si uiuo quanta fuere, forent.

So Merkel and Palmer, without construction. The meaning is 'si tanta forent, quanta Hectore uiuo fuere': therefore the punctuation must be either that of Heinsius and Ehwald

Hectore si uiuo quanta fuere forent,

or else

Hectore, si, uiuo quanta fuere, forent.

x 110

illic qui silices, Thesea, uincat, habes.

So the five modern editors. But the construction, as everyone must know, is 'illic habes Thesea, qui silices uincat'; so you must either write 'illic, qui' with Burmann or leave out all the commas with Heinsius.

Now I come to examples like xviii 191 where hyperbaton is hitherto unrecognised or at any rate unexpressed.

iii 55 sq.

scilicet ut, quamuis ueniam dotata, repellas
et mecum fugias, quae tibi dantur, opes.

So Heinsius Riese Sedlmayer and Ehwald, with a wrong sense.

et mecum fugias quae tibi dantur, opes.

So Merkel and Palmer, even worse. The construction is 'et opes, quae mecum dantur, fugias': therefore the punctuation must be either

et, mecum, fugias, quae tibi dantur, opes,

or else

et mecum fugias quae tibi dantur opes.

xv 103 sq.

nil de te mecum est, nisi tantum iniuria; nec tu,
admoneat quod te, munus amantis habes.

The reading *tu...te* for *te...tu* is the excellent and generally accepted correction of Burmann; and it is clear from his note that he quite understood the construction of the sentence: 'nec tu munus habes, quod te amantis admoneat'. But how to express this by punctuation he did not know; and he and all the editors print the passage thus, as if 'amantis' belonged to 'munus'. It should either be

nec tu,
admoneat quod te, munus, amantis, habes,

or else all the commas between 'nec' and 'habes' should disappear.

xx 93 sq.

hoc quoque, cum ius sit, sit scriptum iniuria nostrum:
quod de me solo nempe queraris, habes.

So the editors. But of course 'nempe' belongs to the principal verb, not to the relative clause: write

quod de me solo, nempe, queraris, habes,

or else omit the comma after 'queraris'.

Here I should like to add that the punctuation of ars ii 676 ascribed to me in the new Corpus Poetarum is the property of Heinsius and is not strictly correct. It should be

adde quod est illis operum prudentia maior,
solus, et, artifices qui facit, usus adest;

for the construction is 'et usus adest, qui solus artifices facit.'

XIX 175–180.

Vt semel intrauit Colchos Pagasaeus Iason,
impositam celeri Phasida puppe tulit.
ut semel Idaeus Lacedaemona uenit adulter,
cum praeda rediit protinus ille sua.
tu, quam saepe petis quod amas, tam saepe relinquis,
et, quotiens graue fit puppibus ire, natas.

'You swim, whenever it becomes troublesome to sail'. What in the world is supposed to be the meaning of this? Does Leander sail in fair weather and swim only in foul? Quite the reverse: he swims in fair weather and only in foul does he begin to think about sailing, xviii 11. But suppose it were so: what have such words to do with the context?

Nemo omnibus horis sapit, not even Nicolaus Heinsius: it was he who adopted the *fit* of P and G and A: his father read *sit* with V, and so did Bentley. But our modern editors, who take little notice of Heinsius when he is scattering pearls and diamonds, are quite willing to make amends by following him where he is wrong, and they all print this *fit*: it is in P, P is the best MS, scientific criticism consists in adhering to the best MS: if it gives sense be thankful; if none, never mind.

The meaning of the true text,

et, quotiens graue *sit* puppibus ire, natas,

is this: 'tot facis natationes, quot uelificationes facere graue sit': 'quotiens' belongs not to 'sit' but to 'puppibus ire'. Leander swims to and fro with such frequency that even to *sail* with the same frequency would be a toil and a trouble. He is therefore much unlike to Paris and Iason.

XX 13–16.

Nunc quoque idem timeo, sed idem tamen acrius illud:
adsumpsit uires auctaque flamma mora est.
quique fuit numquam paruus nunc tempore longo
et spe, quam dederas tu mihi, creuit amor.

idem timeo stultifies the whole passage: the required sense is unmistakable, *idem cupio*; and *cupio* Bentley conjectures. But write

nunc quoque <auemus> idem, sed idem tamen acrius illud.

a is merely *q* without a tail: hence the two letters are pretty often confounded, and you find for instance *eadem* interchanged with *equidem* (*eqdem*). Therefore *auem'* is easily mistaken for *quem* and easily lost after *-que*.

XX 175–180.

Hoc faciente subis tam saeua pericula uitae;
atque utinam pro te, qui mouet illa, cadat.
quem si reppuleris nec, quem dea damnat, amaris,
et tu continuo, certe ego saluus ero.
siste metum, uirgo: stabili potiere salute,
fac modo polliciti conscia templa colas.

On the chaos of 177–179 the first ray of light has been thrown by Mr Ehwald, who has recognised that the apodosis to 'si reppuleris nec amaris' is in 179 and that 178 is

parenthetical. I will neglect for a moment the contents of 178 and will give the gist of the passage to clear the way for their discussion: 'it is the suit of my rival which endangers your life: heaven send that he may perish instead. If you will reject him, and refuse to favour one on whom Diana frowns, then—fear no more, maiden—then will sound health be yours, do you but revere the temple which heard your vow.'

Now *certe*, to begin with, is unmetrical. The elision of a long syllable in the latter half of a pentameter occurs nowhere else in either Ovid or his imitators; and even the 'non ut ames oro, *uerum ut* amare sinas' of xv 96 is easily amended by Heinsius to *me sed*, which fell out after *mesoro*. Secondly, *certe* perverts the sense: 'and you will be well forthwith, *at any rate* I shall' (even if you are not). If Cydippe is not well, neither can Acontius be, for 'iuncta salus nostra est,' says he at 233 sq., 'miserere meique tuique: | quid dubitas unam ferre duobus opem?' Thirdly, the MSS vary: P does not contain these verses, G omits *tu* and adds it at the end of the line, cod. Bernensis 478 (saec. xiii) has *tunc* (*tc̄*) instead of it. I would write

(continuo *per te* <tunc> ego saluus ero)

'straightway, thanks to you, my welfare will be secured': see 233 sq. already cited and also 186 'teque simul serua meque datamque fidem'. *tc̄* fell out after *te* and was inserted before *continuo* with *et* to eke out the verse. *per te* is corrupted to *certe* at Prop. ii 18 29 and Sen. Herc. Oet. 1799. The parenthesis, anticipating as it does the contents of the next line, is not at all to be admired; but it is no worse than iii 30 'uenerunt ad te Telamone et Amyntore nati | ...Laertaque satus, per quos comitata redirem | (auxerunt blandas grandia dona preces) | uiginti fuluos operoso ex aere lebetas' cet.

XX 197–198.

Non agitur de me: cura maiore laboro:
anxia sunt uitae pectora nostra tuae.

Neither P nor G contains these lines, and the oldest MS which does contain them, A (saec. xi–xii), has *uita...tua*; and the ablative is received into the text by Messrs Riese and Sedlmayer, though I do not know what they suppose it to mean. I conjecture

anxia sunt *causa* pectora nostra *tua*.

For this confusion compare Cic. pro Clu. 59 164 'habetis, iudices, quae in totam *causam* de moribus A. Cluentii...accusatores collegerunt', where one family of MSS has *uitam*, and Ovid her. vi 54 'milite tam forti *causa* tuenda fuit', which is Merkel's correction for *uita*.

XXI 55–58.

Dic mihi nunc, solitoque tibi ne decipe more:
quid facies odio, sic ubi amore noces?
si laedis quod amas, hostem sapienter amabis.
me precor, ut serues, perdere uelle uelis.

58 'locus manifeste corruptus' says Heinsius; and I have never seen any real defence of *uelle uelis*. Burmann absurdly quotes am. iii 11 50 'me quoque uelle uelis' where the subject of 'uelle' is 'me'. A much more learned and able attempt is Markland's in his *Remarks on the Epistles of Brutus*, pp. 85-9: he quotes from Cicero and Livy six examples of *nolite uelle*, and Ruhnken adds one of *noli uelle* from Nepos. But these are all imperatives: now the verb 'nolo' in the imperative loses its proper force and merely prohibits. Markland himself thinks that *nolite uelle* will not justify *nolite nolle*: neither, I think, will it justify *nolis uelle*, still less *uelis uelle*. The nearest parallels I know of are met. x 132 '*uelle* mori *statuit*' and Catull. 93 1 'nil nimium *studeo*, Caesar, tibi *uelle* placere'; and these are inadequate. I believe therefore that Heinsius is right in requiring a vocative instead of *uelle*. He proposes *dure*;[1] but Acontius does not mean to injure Cydippe, he injures her without meaning it; so it is not only easier but apter to write

me precor, ut serues, perdere, *laeue*,
uelis.

laeuus is a blunderer, a man who when he shoots at a pigeon invariably kills a crow: the best way for him to make Cydippe well will be to wish her ill. Probably in the sequence *leueuelis* one *eu* was omitted, then added overhead, then inserted wrongly, *ueleuelis*.

[1] Mr. Marindin suggests *dire*, which gives a fitting sense. Either word would readily fall out after *-dere*, but I do not know if *uelle* would readily occur to the scribe for a stopgap.

XXI 205, 206.

Si mihi lingua foret, tu nostra iustius ira,
qui mihi tendebas retia, dignus eras.

Cydippe has been telling Acontius how coldly and rudely she treats his rival: then come these lines, 'locus corruptus', as Heinsius says: 'si mihi lingua foret' is a truly amazing irrelevancy; and besides, she has a tongue. Gronovius proposed 'si *me digna forem*', and van Lennep 'si *mens aequa* foret': the latter is just the sense required but the words are these:

mens nisi iniqua foret, tu nostra cet.

mnisi is much like *mihisi*, and *iniqua* is almost the same as *lingua*.

XXI 237, 238.

Vnde tibi fauor hic? nisi quod noua forte reperta est
quae capiat magnos littera lecta deos.

Cydippe is not saying that such a 'littera' has really been invented: she mentions the notion as barely conceivable; so 'quod reperta est' is wrong. Two of our scanty authorities give *nisi forte noua reperta est*. Write

nisi <si> noua forte reperta est cet.

Compare iv 111 '*nisi si* manifesta negamus' Heinsius, *nisi* P, *nisi nos* the other MSS; Mart. ii 8 7 '*quasi si* manifesta negemus' Heinsius, *quae si* some MSS, *quasi nos* others.

VI 139, 140.

Lemniadum facinus culpo, non miror, Iason.
quamlibet iratis ipse dat arma dolor.

iratis is not in P, which has nothing between *quamlibet* and *ipse*: it is added by the second hand and occurs also in a few other MSS. G and most MSS have *quamlibet* (or *quaelibet* or *quodlibet*) *ad facinus*, which is unmetrical and evidently interpolated from the hexameter. *iratis* gives almost the reverse of the sense required, but for that very reason is probably a relic of the truth and no interpolation. Bentley and J. F. Heusinger proposed *infirmis*, comparing am. i 7 66 '*quamlibet infirmas* adiuuat ira manus'; and this is accepted by Sedlmayer Ehwald and Palmer. Then, when *ipse* has been altered with Madvig to *iste* or *ille*, the sense is altogether satisfactory.

But there is another word which has as good a sense, as good a parallel, and more likeness to *iratis*:

quamlibet *ignauis* iste dat arma dolor.

See Cato monostich. 23 (P.L.M. Baehr. iii p. 237) quoted by Heinsius: '*quamlibet ignauum* facit indignatio fortem'.

A. E. Housman.

THE QUOTATION FROM *GENESIS* IN THE *DE SUBLIMITATE* (IX. 9).

In the ninth chapter of the *De Sublimitate* the following passage occurs: *ταύτῃ καὶ ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαίων θεσμοθέτης, οὐχ ὁ τυχὼν ἀνήρ, ἐπειδὴ τὴν τοῦ θείου δύναμιν κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν ἐχώρησε καὶ ἐξέφηνεν, εὐθὺς ἐν τῇ εἰσβολῇ γράψας τῶν νόμων 'εἶπεν ὁ θεός' φησί· τί; 'γενέσθω φῶς, καὶ ἐγένετο· γενέσθω γῆ, καὶ ἐγένετο.' Similarly, the legislator of the Jews, no ordinary man, having formed and expressed a worthy conception of the might of the Godhead, writes at the very beginning of his book of laws, 'God said'—what? 'Let light be, and it was: let earth be, and it was.'*

The passage is at once a celebrated and (like the treatise in which it is found) a somewhat neglected one. It seems, therefore, to require, and it will certainly repay, a brief discussion with special reference to the doubts which scholars have at various times cast upon its authenticity. Among the doubters have been Franciscus Portus in the sixteenth century, Daniel Wyttenbach in the eighteenth, and Leonhard Spengel[1] and Louis Vaucher[2] in our own century. The views of the two last critics invite particular attention, and it will be convenient to consider those of Vaucher first.

Vaucher's judgment, upon this point as

[1] *Specimen Emendationum in Cornelium Tacitum.* Monachii, 1852.

[2] *Études Critiques sur le Traité du Sublime et sur les Écrits de Longin.* Genève, 1854.

upon others, is somewhat warped by his prepossessions. His object, throughout his ingenious but unconvincing book, is to prove that Plutarch is the author of the *De Sublimitate*. And with this theory the quotation from *Genesis* but ill accords, in view of Plutarch's general attitude towards the Jews and of the absence of any direct reference to the Jewish scriptures in his accepted works. This preoccupation led Vaucher to emphasize unduly the fact that the passage is not found in the Paris MS. 2036. The Codex Parisinus (P) belongs to the tenth century and is, beyond comparison, the best of the existing manuscripts of the Περὶ Ὕψους. But it has suffered mutilation, not in this part only, but unfortunately in several others. It is here, however, that the largest gap occurs, one which marks the loss of as much as one quaternion (that signed KE) out of a total of seven. But of the eight leaves thus missing from P, two (the first and the last) have been preserved in the remaining MSS., which are usually held to be copies derived, directly or indirectly, from P at a time when it still retained the two leaves. The first leaf is represented, in all the editions of the *De Sublimitate*, by the words ὡς κἂν τοῖς περὶ Ξενοφῶντος.....ἐγὼ μὲν ἠρκέσθην (viii. 1–ix. 4), and the eighth by the words τὸ ἐπ' οὐρανὸν.....ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδέσθαι (ix. 4–ix. 10). Now it is in ix. 9 that the passage in question occurs; or to speak more correctly, the short section 9 consists of it and of it alone.

I have said that the two leaves, thus preserved, appear in all the editions of the *De Sublimitate*. This is true of that of Vaucher himself. He prints the words they contain in full. Section 9, however, he places in brackets. And yet, as far as manuscript authority goes, that section stands or falls with those other sections which rest upon the same evidence. And all these are so characteristic in themselves, and fit so perfectly into their context, that it is impossible to doubt their authenticity. They begin with an enumeration of the five sources of that elevated style which is the theme of the treatise, and they end by giving the larger half of an extract from Homer of which the concluding words (ἐν δὲ φάει καὶ ὄλεσσον) appear duly at the point where P resumes.[1]

Spengel's attitude is more consistent. He too brackets the passage (*Rhetores Graeci*, i. pp. xvi. and 255). But it is noteworthy that, although he was the first editor to place the textual criticism of the *De Sublimitate* on a satisfactory footing by recognising the pre-eminence of P, Spengel does not reject the words on the ground of insufficient documentary support. It is not the external, but the internal evidence, that causes him to regard the section as an interpolation. The words do not seem to him to be at home in their surroundings. He would no doubt have agreed with F. A. Wolf, whom however he does not quote, that they seem to have 'fallen from the skies.'[2]

But a glance at the context will show that the degree of abruptness with which the passage is introduced has been greatly exaggerated, and certainly need awaken little surprise when found in a work which is by no means free from digression and parenthesis. And in truth the abruptness would in some respects be greater if the passage were away. The general subject of the ninth chapter is nobility of nature as a source of lofty diction. Quoting one of his own best things in a rather off-hand manner, like a true critic, the author says at the beginning of the chapter: 'In some other place I have written to this effect: "Sublimity is the echo of a great soul."' (γέγραφά που καὶ ἑτέρωθι τὸ τοιοῦτον· ὕψος μεγαλοφροσύνης ἀπήχημα, ix. 2.) This train of thought he illustrates chiefly, but not entirely, from Homer. Outside Homer, there is in the sections we possess (and it must be remembered that six leaves are missing) a reference to a celebrated saying of Alexander, and another to a poem attributed to Hesiod. It is important to notice these particulars because the critics have sometimes spoken as if the whole chapter were filled with Homer. And when the Homeric passages come, they have a certain unity; they all speak of manifestations of the divine power under various shapes; they end with a reference to the divine greatness and purity, and the divine control over the elements. Into this unity the passage from *Genesis* enters naturally, and after it there comes, by a similarly natural transition, a reference to the deeds of heroic *men* as depicted in Homer. 'In his poem, the battle of the Greeks is suddenly veiled by mist and baffling night. Then Ajax, at his wits' end, cries: "Father Zeus, do thou deliver us, the sons of the Achaeans, from the gloom, and make clear day, and grant us the vision of our eyes;

[1] I should perhaps mention here that I have recently had an opportunity of examining P 2036 for myself in the Bibliothèque Nationale.

[2] F. A. Wolf, *Vorlesungen über die Alterthumswissenschaft*, i. 330: 'Diese Stelle fällt wie vom Himmel hinein.'

and if thou must slay, slay in the light."'[1] Now Spengel would have us believe that section 9 is but a marginal comment—the work of some Christian or Jew—on Ajax' call for light, as quoted in section 10. We cannot deny that such a gloss, singularly inept though it would be, might conceivably have been entered in the margin, and from thence transferred into the text at the wrong point. But to this doubly improbable possibility most impartial judges will prefer the likelihood that the passage stands where it was first placed. And it may be added that the hand of the author of the Treatise seems clearly revealed in minute points of wording, such as the *ταύτῃ καί* (cp. ix. 4) with which the passage is introduced.[2]

Another objection raised, on internal grounds, to the quotation is that it is not only *unexpected* but *inexact*. The first portion of the divine fiat differs slightly, and the second differs altogether, from the original as we know it. The question, indeed, suggests itself whether the passage can—with reference to any original known to us—properly be described as 'a quotation' at all. It reproduces the substance rather than the precise form of three verses at the beginning of *Genesis*. The verses may be transcribed here from the latest text of the Septuagint version, though we ought not to take it for granted that the author had that version in his mind or before his eyes, nor yet that he is echoing a Hebrew text in every way identical with ours. I. 3 : *καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός Γενηθήτω φῶς· καὶ ἐγένετο φῶς.* I. 9 : *καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός Συναχθήτω τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ὑποκάτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εἰς συναγωγὴν μίαν, καὶ ὀφθήτω ἡ ξηρά· καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως.* 10 : *καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ὁ θεὸς τὴν ξηρὰν γῆν.*[3] Such 'conflations' are not unnatural when words are quoted from memory, and they are specially common in our author. Two examples, in which lines from different books of the *Iliad* are combined, will be found in sections 6 and 8 of this very chapter. The whole treatise is, it need hardly be recalled, a small treasury of extracts taken from the most various authors, —Sappho and Thucydides on the one hand, Aratus and Timaeus on the other. There is, therefore, abundant opportunity of observing the writer's habits of citation.[4] And it has been suggested that, here as elsewhere, he has been influenced, unconsciously no doubt, by his love of rhythm and parallelism :—

γενέσθω φῶς, καὶ ἐγένετο.
γενέσθω γῆ, καὶ ἐγένετο.[5]

But this and all similar suggestions, however interesting, must be subject to the reservation that we do not know the exact nature of the source upon which the author is drawing.

It is necessary, moreover, to bear in mind that the more inexact the quotation, the less reason will there be for regarding the passage as an interpolation. Only a Jew, or a Christian, would have been likely to interpolate it, and Jew or Christian would have done the work with care and accuracy. Besides, such an interpolator would hardly have been content with describing Moses as 'no ordinary man.' Altogether, the arguments in favour of the theory of interpolation seem weak and precarious. The manuscript attestation is adequate ; the passage harmonises with the context ; the freedom in quotation is like our author and unlike an interpolator.

It remains, however, to glance at certain difficulties, of an *à priori* nature, which have been thought to attend this reference to the Jewish lawgiver in the work of a Greek writer. And we are thus brought face to face with the question of the authorship, and the date, of the *De Sublimitate*. We have hitherto spoken vaguely of 'the author,' and it will be best still to do so. It is a choice between so doing and using some such designation as 'Longinus' (in inverted commas) or even *Pseudolonginus*. I hope elsewhere to discuss in detail the difficult problem of the authorship, but I am afraid that, with the evidence at present within reach, we cannot do more than acquiesce in the inscription which, in one of the manuscripts, attributes the treatise to an 'anonymous' writer. However, the views currently held upon the matter may be, roughly but conveniently, ranged under two heads. The treatise belongs either to : (*A*) the third century and Longinus, Queen Zenobia's minister; or to (*B*) the first century and some unknown writer. What peculiar

[1] ix. 10 : *ἀχλὺς ἄφνω καὶ νύξ ἄπορος αὐτῷ τὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐπέχει μάχην· ἔνθα δὲ ὁ Αἴας ἀμηχανῶν*
Ζεῦ πάτερ, φησίν, ἀλλὰ σὺ ῥῦσαι ὑπ' ἠέρος υἷας Ἀχαιῶν,
ποίησον δ' αἴθρην, δὸς δ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδέσθαι·
ἐν δὲ φάει καὶ ὄλεσσον.

[2] The contextual evidence, for and against the passage, is succinctly set forth by Giovanni Canna, *Della Sublimità : Libro attribuito a Cassio Longino*. Firenze, 1871. Pp. 18, 19.

[3] Or should we see a reflection of i. 3, 6, rather than of i. 3. 9, 10?

[4] Cp. H. Hersel, *Qua in citandis scriptorum et poetarum locis auctor libelli περὶ ὕψους usus sit ratione*. Berlin, 1884.

[5] J. Freytag, *De anonymi περὶ ὕψους sublimi genere dicendi*. Hildesheim, 1897. P. 77.

difficulties, then, are presented by the passage upon the first of these suppositions, and upon the second? For upon both suppositions alike difficulties have been felt and urged.

It has already been mentioned that Portus (1511–1581 A.D.) was the first scholar to express misgivings with regard to the authenticity of the section. In his day, and for long afterwards, the traditional ascription of the treatise to the historical Longinus was undisputed. But Portus thought it unlikely that the Longinus of history would be acquainted with the Jewish scriptures. In this view he has not found many to follow him. For was not Longinus a pupil of the leading Neoplatonists at Alexandria, and has not he himself ranked 'Paul of Tarsus' high in the hierarchy of Greek oratorical genius?[1]

But this is not all, for the commentator Schurzfleisch of Wittenberg has provided us with an independent suggestion, with the design of removing the difficulty, if difficulty there be. In view of the wider acceptance which Schurzfleisch's suggestion has gained since an earlier date has been claimed for the Treatise, it is important to observe that it was made by him as far back as the year 1711, when no one had begun to doubt that Longinus was the author. His words are worth quoting: 'Longinus fortasse non tam septuaginta seniores legit, quam hoc exemplum a Caecilio rhetore, qui *τὴν δόξαν Ἰουδαῖος σοφὸς τὰ Ἑλληνικὰ* vocatur a Suida, mutuatus est.'[2] He thus threw out the pregnant hint that the illustration may have been taken, not directly from the Septuagint, but from Caecilius. Caecilius, the rhetorician of Calacte and the contemporary of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, is described, in Suidas' biographical notice of him, as 'in faith a Jew.'[3] It is, therefore, quite possible, as Schurzfleisch saw, that the author, whose Treatise takes a similar work by Caecilius as its starting-point, may have borrowed this Hebraic illustration of sublimity from him. Thus viewed, the extract may be regarded as a vague recollection, and reproduction, of Caecilius. The suggestion is now generally accepted. But while the theory may be regarded as highly probable, we ought, I think, to recognise that the author's general conception of Moses does not seem to be entirely based upon this fragment of his writings. The very words 'no ordinary man' seem to imply some independent knowledge extending beyond this isolated quotation. The writer possesses the general knowledge that he is dealing with 'the Jewish lawgiver,' whose actual name seemingly he does not think his readers will require. He possesses also the particular knowledge that the passage is to be found 'at the very beginning of his laws.' It may further be noted that he appears to direct special attention to the sublimity of the passage by his somewhat rhetorical use of the interrogative pronoun in introducing it.

There can be no doubt, however, that the traditional view that Longinus was the author is steadily losing ground. Scepticism first commenced at the beginning of this century, in the year 1808, when Amati directed attention to the fact that manuscript authority pointed not to 'Dionysius Longinus' as the author, but rather to 'Dionysius *or* Longinus.' Into the details of the controversy that followed we cannot here enter. Enough to say that the best critical opinion now attributes the work to some writer, yet to be identified, of the first century, and that the passage under review must, if its authenticity is to be placed beyond question, be shown not to be inconsistent with that supposition. At this point the likelihood of the author's obligation in this as in other matters to Caecilius, who flourished in the time of Augustus, comes again to our aid; and the likelihood is perhaps all the greater if the author followed him closely in time as well as in general treatment. But independently of this, it would not be difficult to show that the Graeco-Roman world of the first century was no stranger to the history and the antiquities of the Jews.[4]

Wolf, indeed, in a passage already cited, admitted this. He thought that the section was probably a gloss by a Christian, though he would not expel it from the text, especially as the text itself was so fragmentary. But he states expressly that he does not

[1] The reference of course is to the fragment (if it is to be regarded as genuine) given, *e.g.*, by Vaucher, *Études*, p. 309.

[2] Schurzfleischius, *Animadversiones ad Dionysii Longini περὶ ὕψους commentationem.* Vitembergae, 1711. P. 23.

[3] For Caecilius reference may be made to Théodore Reinach, *Quid Judaeo cum Verre* (in *Revue des Études Juives*, xxvi., 36–46) and to F. Caccialanza, *Cecilio da Calatte e l' Ellenismo a Roma nel secolo d' Augusto* (in *Rivista di Filologia e d' Istruzione Classica*, xviii. 1–73). An article, by the present writer, on *Caecilius of Calacte: a contribution to the history of Greek Literary Criticism*, will be found in the current number (71) of the *American Journal of Philology.*

[4] This point was emphasized (*Philologus* I. pp. 630, 631: year 1846) by G. Roeper, who also identified, from the Venice Scholia to the Iliad, the Ammonius mentioned in c. xiii.

base his scepticism on the inherent improbability of any reference to Moses. The name of Moses, as he remarks, occurs even in Strabo's writings; and he might have added, in those of Diodorus Siculus and earlier writers still.[1]

The question of early references to, or quotations from, the Old Testament in Greek writers deserves more attention than it seems hitherto to have received. The late Dr. Edwin Hatch's 'Essay on Early Quotations from the Septuagint' does not profess to be more than its title implies. Professor Ryle's 'Philo and Holy Scripture' is exhaustive within its field; but the example it sets needs perhaps to be followed in other directions. In his introduction Prof. Ryle states with truth that 'Philo's testimony to the Septuagint text has the twofold value of being earlier, by more than two centuries, than our earliest extant MS.; and of being derived from a non-Christian, a Graeco-Judaic, source, separate in time and character from the great mass of other evidence.' The section we are discussing (especially if we are right in conjecturing that Caecilius is its parent) possesses a somewhat parallel interest, an interest which is in some respects not less but greater because of the want of exact correspondence between the passage and any originals known to us.

It is important to notice not only the words contained in the section, but also the way in which they are introduced. They are attributed to ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαίων θεσμοθέτης, a designation which corresponds closely with the words (ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαίων νομοθέτης Μωϋσῆς) with which Philo himself introduces a quotation from the opening of *Genesis*. Further, they are said to be found 'in the very beginning of the laws.' Similarly, Philo denotes the Pentateuch by the term οἱ νόμοι, though he more commonly refers to it as ὁ νόμος or ἡ νομοθεσία.[2]

But the resemblances which the Treatise affords with the writings of Philo do not end with this passage. In the concluding chapters, the author expresses his desire 'to clear up a question which a philosopher recently started in conversation with me.'[3] The question was the dearth of high natures and high utterance in that age, and the explanation, suggested the philosopher, was to be found in the decline of the spirit of freedom. 'To-day, he went on, we seem in our boyhood to learn the lessons of a righteous servitude, being all but swathed, when our thoughts are yet young and tender, in its customs and observances, and without a taste of the fairest and most animating source of eloquence (by which, he added, I mean freedom), so that we emerge in no other guise than that of sublime flatterers. This is the reason, he maintained, why no slave ever becomes an orator, although all other faculties may belong to menials. In the slave there immediately burst out signs of fettered liberty of speech, of the dungeon as it were, of a man habituated to buffetings.' (*'οἱ δὲ νῦν ἐοίκαμεν' ἔφη παιδομαθεῖς εἶναι δουλείας δικαίας, τοῖς αὐτῆς ἔθεσι καὶ ἐπιτηδεύμασιν ἐξ ἁπαλῶν ἔτι φρονημάτων μόνον οὐκ ἐνεσπαργανωμένοι καὶ ἄγευστοι καλλίστου καὶ γονιμωτάτου λόγων νάματος, τὴν ἐλευθερίαν' ἔφη 'λέγω, διόπερ οὐδὲν ὅτι μὴ κόλακες ἐκβαίνομεν μεγαλοφυεῖς'. διὰ τοῦτο τὰς μὲν ἄλλας ἕξεις καὶ εἰς οἰκέτας πίπτειν ἔφασκεν, δοῦλον δὲ μηδένα γίνεσθαι ῥήτορα· εὐθὺς γὰρ ἀναζεῖν τὸ ἀπαρρησίαστον καὶ οἷον ἔμφρουρον ὑπὸ συνηθείας ἀεὶ κεκονδυλισμένον. De Sublim.* xliv. 3, 4). Now this passage will be found to present some remarkable points of resemblance, in thought and wording, with a passage of Philo which deserves full quotation: *ἐγὼ δ' οὐ τεθαύμακα, εἰ πεφορημένος καὶ μιγὰς ὄχλος, ἐθῶν καὶ νόμων τῶν ὁπωσοῦν εἰσηγμένων ἀκλεὴς δοῦλος, ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἔτι σπαργάνων ὑπακούειν ὡς ἂν δεσποτῶν ἢ τυράννων ἐκμαθών, κατακεκονδυλισμένος τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ μέγα καὶ νεανικὸν φρόνημα λαβεῖν μὴ δυνάμενος πιστεύει τοῖς ἅπαξ παραδοθεῖσι καὶ τὸν νοῦν ἐάσας ἀγύμναστον ἀδιερευνήτοις καὶ ἀνεξετάστοις συναινέσεσί τε καὶ ἀρνήσεσι χρῆται.* (Philo, *De Ebrietate*, 198: vol. ii., p. 208, in Cohn and Wendland's edition, 1896–97).[4] Similarly, but not so convincingly, *τῇδε*

[1] Cp. Th. Reinach, *Textes d'auteurs Grecs et Romains relatifs au Judaisme*, pp. 14 ff.; Pape-Benseler, *Griechische Eigennamen*, p. 969; J. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, ii., pp. 177 ff.

[2] Ryle, l.c., pp. xix., xx.—Reference should also be made to passages quoted by Th. Reinach, *Textes d'auteurs, etc.*, pp. 18, 82, 361. The first passage is of special interest, particularly if the very early date claimed for it is correct. In it the end of 'the laws' seems to mean the end of *Leviticus: προσγέγραπται δὲ καὶ τοῖς νόμοις ἐπὶ τελευτῆς ὅτι Μωσῆς ἀκούσας τοῦ θεοῦ τάδε λέγει τοῖς Ἰουδαιόις.*

[3] *ἐκεῖνο μέντοι λοιπόν.....διασαφῆσαι, Τερεντιανὲ φίλτατε, ὅπερ ἐζήτησέ τις τῶν φιλοσόφων πρὸς ἐμὲ ἔναγχος.* xliv. 1.—*πρὸς ἐμὲ ἔναγχος* is Cobet's reading, in place of *προσέναγχος* as given by P. But there is reason to doubt whether a change is necessary, and with a view to the possible solution of the vexed question of the authorship it is better not to allow even slight deviations from P to pass unnoticed.

[4] Cp. Jacob Bernays (after Ruhnken) in *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, I., pp. 347–356; Hans von Arnim, *Quellenstudien zu Philo von Alexandria*, pp. 66 and 120.—One cannot help suggesting that Philo himself may conceivably have been the *φιλόσοφος* into whose mouth the words in the *De Sublimitate* are put.

κἀκεῖσε ἀγχιστρόφως ἀντισπώμενοι (*De Subl.* xxii. 1) may be compared with ἀνθελκόμενος πρὸς ἑκατέρου μέρους ὧδε κἀκεῖσε (Philo, *De Vita Mosis*, iii., p. 678). And the likeness is seen in single words as well as in clauses. In the section just quoted from the *De Sublimitate*, we note the Philonic word εἱρμός, and others elsewhere such as ἐπάλληλος, κατασκελετεύω, προκόσμημα, μαγειρεῖον, προσυπογράφειν. And let it be added here that the word τὸ γλωττόκομον, used of a 'cage' in *De Subl.* xliv. 5, has a distinct affinity with the Septuagint, and also (at a later date) with Aquila, of additions to whose fragments we have lately had welcome tidings.

The points of contact between the author of the περὶ ὕψους and the Jews are not, however, confined even to Moses, Caecilius, and Philo. There is also Josephus, who has referred to Moses in terms almost identical with those used in ix. 9. His words are: ἤδη τοίνυν τοὺς ἐντευξομένους τοῖς βιβλίοις παρακαλῶ τὴν γνώμην θεῷ προσανέχειν, καὶ δοκιμάζειν τὸν ἡμέτερον νομοθέτην, εἰ τήν τε φύσιν αὐτοῦ ἀξιώς κατενόησε καὶ τῇ δυνάμει πρεπούσας ἀεὶ τὰς πράξεις ἀνέθηκε, πάσης καθαρὸν τὸν περὶ αὐτοῦ φυλάξας λόγον τῆς παρ' ἄλλοις ἀσχήμονος μυθολογίας, καίτοι γε, ὅσον ἐπὶ μήκει χρόνου καὶ παλαιότητι, πολλὴν ἔχων ἄδειαν ψευδῶν πλασμάτων (Fl. Josephus, *Antiqq. Iud.*, Prooem.—The resemblance in the spaced words will be seen to be a close one). There is also Theodorus, mentioned in *De Subl.* iii. 5, who had possibly been one of the author's teachers in rhetoric, and who himself sprang from Gadara in Syria.[1] And it is hardly necessary to add that the conquest of Judaea by Pompey, and the provision by Alexandria of a common meeting-ground for Jews, Greeks, and Romans, must have multiplied points of contact in ways altogether unknown to us.

Mommsen, indeed, goes so far as to suggest that the author may himself possibly have been a Jew. He speaks of the Treatise as one of the finest works of literary criticism surviving from antiquity, as written in the early days of the empire by an unknown author, and as the production, if not of a Jew, yet of a man who revered Moses and Homer in equal measure (Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte*, V. 494). But against this tentative suggestion of Jewish origin must be weighed the general tone and character of ix. 9, and the fact that in xii. 4, when about to compare Cicero and Demosthenes, the author uses the words, 'if we *as Greeks* are at liberty to form an opinion upon the point.'[2] If a Jew, he must have been a most highly Hellenised Jew.

Before concluding this short paper, I should like to add that I have designedly abstained from ascertaining whether the passage, in its various bearings, has been the subject of recent discussion in the literature more especially connected with theology. I am, however, informed, by a theologian of eminence, that the section has been somewhat neglected in recent years, because of the doubts entertained as to both the authorship of the Treatise and the authenticity of the passage. If this is so, it seems a matter for some regret. I do not know that the section possesses any special evidential value, but it certainly has a distinct interest of its own. That interest is not less but greater if we find ourselves driven to assign the *De Sublimitate* to the first rather than to the third century of our era. And as to the authenticity of the passage, no doubt on that score will, I think, be harboured by any theologian, however scrupulously anxious he may be not to subordinate truth to apologetics, if only he will examine the evidence for himself and will remember further that scholars so distinguished as Bergk[3] and Bernays[4] uphold the passage as genuine, and that the two standard modern editions[5] of the *De Sublimitate* print it as an integral part of the text.

W. Rhys Roberts.

[1] Sueton., *Tib.*, 57; Quintil., *Instit. Orat.*, iii. 1, 17.

[2] xii. 4: εἰ καὶ ἡμῖν ὡς Ἕλλησιν ἐφεῖταί τι γινώσκειν.

[3] Th. Bergk, *Griechische Litteraturgeschichte*, iv., 553 n. 52.

[4] J. Bernays, *Ges. Abh.*, I. 353, 4.

[5] The critical editions of Iahn-Vahlen (Bonn, 1887) and of Spengel-Hammer *Rhetores Graeci*, I. 2, Leipzig, 1894. In the latter, Hammer has deliberately removed the brackets in which Spengel, the original editor (1853), enclosed the passage.

THE PORCIAN COINS AND THE PORCIAN LAWS.

Although coins are of very great value in the reconstruction of the foreign department in the constitutional history of Rome, there are not many which throw light on points of detail connected with the legal changes in the city itself. Hence the interest attaching to the two well-known types struck by members of the Porcian house. They record a revolution of some kind in the criminal law effected by the coiners or their forefathers; they preserve the memory of an extension of the right of appeal or of the prohibition of a magistrate to scourge a citizen—both of them changes vaguely indicated by our literary authorities and attached to the names of Porcii. But here our direct knowledge ends. Neither the coins nor the laws can be dated; the types of the former are indeterminate and no literary authority tells us the exact work accomplished by the latter. The explanations hitherto given by modern authorities of the correspondence of the two are vague and seem to me to be, on historical and legal grounds, unsatisfactory. Although it is almost impossible to establish certain conclusions where direct evidence is so slight, I shall venture to suggest a hypothesis as to the result effected by at least one of these laws which, while it is the only one which fits the symbolic representation on the most significant of the coins, is also in harmony with the few literary notices of the Porcian legislation.

If we appeal first to the coins, we find that one of the types may be briefly dismissed as wholly indeterminate. It is furnished by *denarii* which contain the legend *Roma* with the triumvir's name 'M. Porc[ius] Laeca'; on the reverse is Liberty holding a cap and sceptre and crowned by Victory, in a *quadriga* galloping to the right. The coin cannot be dated, and all that we can say is that this type is an obvious allusion to some Porcian law or laws which either extended the *provocatio* or prohibited some kind of punishment from being inflicted on the citizen.

But the other type goes into some detail and gives us a vivid picture of the working of some great protective law. This too is furnished by *denarii* which contain the legend *Roma* with a 'P. Laeca' as the triumvir. But the reverse shows us a warrior clad in a cuirass, armed with a sword and accompanied by a lictor who carries the *fasces*. The warrior stretches out his hand over the head of a citizen clad in the *toga*. The citizen, with upraised hand, appears to be uttering some word or words. Below we read *provoco*.

The usually accepted explanation of this type is that given by Cavedoni (*Ripostigli*, p. 121). He sees in it an allusion to the extension of the right of *provocatio* by which it was granted to Roman citizens even in the face of military command (*imperium militiae*). Mommsen, who accepts this explanation, interprets 'military command' in its widest and undoubtedly its truest sense to mean command outside the mile-limit of civic jurisdiction—that is, command in the provinces as well as in the army; the law here commemorated limited the imperator's capital jurisdiction by submitting the threat of executing such jurisdiction to appeal (Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, ii. p. 117; Mommsen-Blacas, *Histoire de la monnaie Romaine*, ii. p. 365). The same explanation is adopted by Babelon (*Monnaies de la République Romaine*, ii. p. 369), if by 'military authority' he means the universal authority of a pro-magistrate; his words are: 'the *denarius* of P. Laeca alludes to the connection of these laws with the military authority, the omnipotence of which they attempted to restrain.' Stevenson in his *Dictionary of Roman Coins* (*s.v.* Porcius Laeca, p. 642), was more cautious. He thought indeed that the coin recalled the memory of the Porcian law which 'gave on appeal (*provocatio*) exemption from the ignominious punishment of scourging'; but he continues: 'this exemption was confined in its operation to towns and cities. Soldiers on duty were still left entirely dependent on the will of their commander-in-chief.' This explanation contains more elements of truth than that of any commentator that I have seen. It shows a recognition of two facts forgotten or ignored by those who have dealt recently with the question. These are (1) that the Porcian law could not have forbidden scourging simply but could only—following the analogy of other laws connected with the *provocatio*—have submitted the threat of such scourging to appeal; (2) that capital punishments continued to be inflicted by Roman generals on their soldiers to the latest period of the Republic (*C.R.* x. p. 228). He gives no evidence for the further view that the 'exemption was confined in its operation to towns and cities.' It may have been a conclusion from the fact that the Porcian coin represents the appellant

citizen as clad in the *toga*. It was a natural conclusion but one not warranted by historical evidence, which seems to show that the proconsul claimed the right of life and death over Roman citizens within his domain down to a late period of the Republic (*C.R.* x. p. 229), and it is an explanation which is not rendered inevitable by the situation depicted on the coin.

The crucial difficulty presented by this picture is to understand what relations of jurisdiction could exist between a general in a cuirass and a citizen in a *toga*. The dress of the victim excludes the idea of military jurisdiction on a campaign; the garb of the threatening commander is inconsistent with the idea of jurisdiction within Rome: while the idea of ordinary provincial jurisdiction —if even we suppose that a proconsul usually went about his judicial business in fighting garb without even veiling his cuirass with the *paludamentum*—must be set aside in face of the historical evidence which shows that such jurisdiction continued to be unlimited. We must go elsewhere for a situation which will bring an *imperator* and a *civis* face to face. The situation may be found by a discovery of the probable evil which one at least of the Porcian laws was meant to meet.

The three Porcian laws mentioned by our authorities seem at first sight to have resulted in rather a complex piece of legislation; but a closer examination reveals a unity of purpose that does not appear on the surface, and this unity may be reflected in the not unfrequent mention of a single 'lex Porcia' as though it embodied the spirit of the whole Porcian legislation.

One provision of these laws seems, if the passages describing it are literally interpreted, to have but a slender connection with our subject. Two passages in Sallust's *Catiline* seem to say that a lex Porcia extended the theory and practice of *exsilium* by permitting exile after, and not merely before, condemnation by the people, and thus preparing the way for the place held by voluntary banishment in the *quaestiones perpetuae*.[1] In this change the lex Porcia was assisted by 'other' laws. The change itself, though important in its consequences, was slight in so far as it did not alter the fundamental character of *exsilium*: and consequently we need not be surprised that it is not dwelt on by Cicero and our other authorities, who treat exclusively of the relations of these laws with the *provocatio* and the punishment of scourging.[2]

It is, however, just possible that we have in this passage a somewhat careless reference to a law bearing on the *provocatio*; for a law allowing the appeal, and therefore permitting voluntary exile during the hearing of the appeal, might, without much straining of language, be said to grant *exsilium* to the condemned. The statement would harmonise still further with everything else that we know about the Porcian legislation if we could adopt Mommsen's interpretation that *damnatis* here refers to condemnation by a magistrate.[3] It would then be a statement, not of the immediate effect of the law—the *provocatio*—but of its ultimate effect—*exsilium*.

Secondly we are told that 'leges Porciae' attached an adequate sanction to laws enjoining the *provocatio* (Cic. *de Rep.* ii. 31; Liv. x. 9).

Thirdly we hear of a lex Porcia which abolished scourging in some form not precisely specified by our authorities (Cic. *pro Rab.* 3, 8; 4, 12).

The two latter provisions are not necessarily identical; for the language of Cicero in more than one passage, as well as that of Livy, appears to show that a Porcian law attached a fresh sanction to the *provocatio* when employed against capital jurisdiction as well as against the penalty of scourging. Yet their close connection may be gathered from the passages where these aspects of the Porcian legislation are described—a connec-

[1] Sallust, *Cat.* 51, 21. 'Sed, per deos immortales, quam ob rem in sententiam non addidisti, uti prius verberibus in eos animadverteretur? an quia lex Porcia vetat? at aliae leges item condemnatis civibus non animam eripi sed exsilium permitti jubent. §§ 40. tum lex Porcia aliaeque leges paratae sunt, quibus legibus exsilium damnatis permissum est.'

[2] If this interpretation be accepted, the law in question appears to have been considerably later than at least the first lex Porcia which dealt with the *provocatio*; for the theory of *exsilium* here stated differs from that with which Polybius was familiar (vi, 14).

[3] Mommsen in *Neue Jenaische Litteratur-Zeitung*, 1844, p. 258. The acceptance of this interpretation of Mommsen's by no means proves the truth of his main contention in this article, viz. that the condemnation by a magistrate and *provocatio* were invariable elements in a *judicium populi*. The procedure of the *provocatio* and that in an ordinary *judicium populi* were probably distinct. The distinguishing point was that the condemnation by a magistrate existed only in the first. The points of contact between the two processes were (*a*) the formalities of the trial before the people, (*b*) the possibility of *exsilium* (see *C.R.* ix. p. 6). A final proof that the *provocatio* played no part in a *judicium populi* is furnished by the fact that women could be the subjects of a *judicium populi* (Gell. iv. 14, 2), although they did not possess the *provocatio* through not having *communio comitiorum*.

tion which shows that no Porcian law made the scourging of a citizen as such illegal, but merely submitted the threat of such punishment to appeal. In the order of what may be called the legal value of these passages they may be classed as follows:—

(1) Cic. *de leg.* iii. 3, 6; 'magistratus nec oboedientem et noxium civem multa, vinculis, verberibus coerceto, ni par majorve potestas populusve prohibessit, ad quos provocatio esto.'

(2) Cic. *de Rep.* ii. 31, 54; 'neque vero leges Porciae, quae tres sunt trium Porciorum, ut scitis, quidquam praeter sanctionem attulerunt novi.'

(3) Liv. x. 9; 'Porcia tamen lex sola pro tergo civium lata videtur: quod gravi poena, si quis verberasset necassetve civem Romanum, sanxit. Valeria lex (of 300 B.C.), quum eum, qui provocasset, virgis caedi securique necari vetuisset, si quis adversus ea fecisset, nihil ultra quam improbe factum adjecit.'

(4) Cic. *pro Rab.* 3, 8; 'de civibus Romanis contra legem Porciam verberatis aut necatis.'

(5) *Ib.* 4, 12; 'Porcia lex virgas ab omnium civium Romanorum corpore amovit; hic misericors flagella rettulit. Porcia lex libertatem civium lictori eripuit: Labienus, homo popularis, carnifici tradidit.'

(6) Cic ap. Ascon. *in Cornel.* p. 77. 'Etiam haec recentiora [*i.e.* later than the second secession and the creation of ten tribunes 449 B.C.] praetereo: Porciam principium justissimae libertatis' etc.

In (1) and (2) Cicero speaks as a lawyer, as might be expected from the juridical character of the works in which the passages occur. From these statements we gather that scourging was always formally a part of the *coercitio* of a Roman magistrate and that the 'leges Porciae' or the 'lex Porcia' (if we assume that it was only one of these laws that protected the back of the citizen) merely added a sanction to a provision which already allowed an appeal from a threat of *verbera*. The passage of Livy (3) is still more explicit on this point. The contradiction implied in speaking of a law, which prohibited both scourging and death, as passed *sola pro tergo civium* is only apparent; for the death referred to is the execution *more majorum* so vividly described in later times to Nero (Suct. *Ner.* 49). It was death by the axe or by the rod—death, in short, as inflicted by the *fasces*—that alone deserved mention in the early laws of appeal; for they were aimed against the *coercitio* of the magistrate with *imperium*. Perhaps in early times the sacral penalty inflicted by the tribunes—the death from the Tarpeian rock—could be met only by the *intercessio*; but in any case it was not against tribunician but against consular violence that these numerous laws were aimed. And this dual conception of the protection of the citizen's person—from death by scourging as well as from the penalty of scourging—makes it extremely improbable that the *virgis caedi* of the third 'lex Valeria' can refer only to the latter. The passages from Cicero and Livy [(1), (2) and (3)], taken in combination, show that scourging in both forms had already been prohibited by law—a prohibition that was ineffective until a Porcian law or laws had added an efficient sanction. From this point of view the 'lex Porcia' might well be called the *principium justissimae libertatis* [passage (6)].

One of the already-cited passages from Sallust's version of Caesar's speech on the execution of the Catilinarian conspirators also contains an implication that a 'lex Porcia' prohibited scourging. The analogical argument employed is a stronger one if the prohibition was merely against scourging inflicted by a magistrate without appeal than if the law prohibited this punishment absolutely. For the death penalty against which Caesar is arguing in this speech is the death penalty inflicted by administrative decree of the magistrate. 'Why,' he asks, 'violate the *provocatio* in one particular while you respect it in another?'[1]

Of the remaining passages [(4) and (5)], which are taken from Cicero's speech *pro Rabirio*, the first is wholly indeterminate; it might refer equally well to the absolute and to the conditioned prohibition of scourging. The second seems to contain a more distinct reference to an absolute prohibition; but two considerations are sufficient to obviate the necessity of this interpretation. One is that Cicero is speaking here not as a lawyer but as a pleader; this citation of the 'lex Porcia' may be parallel to the equally effective and perhaps equally pointless parade of laws protecting the life of the citizen which is made in the Verrines (v. 63). And, secondly, if Cicero means to imply that the death penalty—and therefore death by scourging—was ever abolished in Roman law, the rhetorical antithesis which we find in this passage is wholly false from a legal point of view. If, indeed, we adopt the view that a Porcian law granted exile after condemnation and suppose that it is this

[1] It was possibly to avoid the appearance of consular *coercitio* that the Catilinarian conspirators were strangled.

provision which is referred to by Cicero, there is rather more point in the passage; but even so it would not contain a valid legal argument: for, unless the condemnation meant is condemnation by the magistrate, the stage at which the law would be effective had not yet been reached in the trial of Rabirius. A higher element of truth in the passage—one which, because it is true, vitiates Cicero's argument—is the statement that the 'lex Porcia' *libertatem civium lictori eripuit.* This indeed it did. Both the 'lex Valeria' and the 'lex Porcia' saved the citizen from the lictor *as the instrument of magisterial 'coercitio.'* It is such salvation that is symbolised on our Porcian coin.

A further, although, it must be admitted, rather unsatisfactory item of evidence in favour of the view that the punishment of scourging was not abolished in Roman law may be drawn from certain words of Seneca (*de ira* 3, 12) and Festus (p. 234 Müller), which imply that, at the time of M. Porcius Cato (consul 195 B.C.) certain laws inflicted scourging as a *poena.*[1]

Whether such laws (if they ever existed) continued on the statute-book until later times is unknown. All that can be gathered from these passages is that Cato, as a typical member of the Porcian house, spoke against the penalty of scourging.

Lastly, if the 'lex Porcia' had absolutely prohibited the scourging of a citizen, the people would, by this act of legislation, have adopted a method of asserting the citizen's rights and limiting the magistrate's power completely different from that which they usually pursued. Such a law would have violated the two leading principles of Roman protective legislation. These principles were the limitation of the power of the magistrate without the limitation of that of the people, and the security for the authority of the people and for the occasional imposition of a justifiably severe penalty by taking from the magistrate the right to execute and not the power to sentence.

Granting that the evidence is in favour of the view that the 'lex Porcia' commanded the observance of the *provocatio* in cases where scourging was threatened by a magistrate, the next stage of our interpretation will be to determine in what department of administration this means of *coercitio* is found.

It is found, so far as the coercion of the Roman citizen not actually on military service is concerned, chiefly, perhaps solely, in connection with the levy (*dilectus*). In the dissensions of 471 B.C. Publilius Volero denied his liability to serve. The only safeguard at this time was the *appellatio* to the tribunes. It was made but they would not listen, and the consuls ordered him to be stripped (Liv. ii. 55). In the middle of the fourth century the chief complaint made against Manlius, on his abdication of the dictatorship, was 'acerbitas in dilectu—laceratione corporum lata — partim virgis caesis, qui ad nomina non respondissent' (Liv. viii. 4). It was such acts of violence that the third 'lex Valeria' and the 'lex Porcia,' so far as they took cognisance of scourging only, were meant to stop.

And here, I think, we have our explanation of the Porcian coin. The imperator in military dress is conducting the *dilectus;* the man in the *toga* is an unwilling recruit; he has been dragged to the magistrate's presence for the traditional means of summary coercion to be applied; but the 'lex Porcia,' commemorated by this coin, has enabled him to utter the magic word *provoco.*

The date of this particular coin, which is wholly uncertain, but is perhaps of the close of the second century B.C., has little bearing on the question under discussion. It must be far later than the prohibition of scourging in the military levy. But the family coins reproduce very ancient history, and any member of the Porcian house may have depicted the most dramatic event of the public life of his ancestors which the family records could recall.

A. H. J. Greenidge.

[1] Seneca, *de ira,* 3, 12. 'Pro scapulis cum dicit Cato significat injuria verberum (Festus "pro injuria verberum"); nam complures leges erant in cives rogatae, quibus sanciebatur poena verberum.'

ON SOME FRAGMENTS OF MACROBIUS' *SATURNALIA*.

PONTANUS, commenting on Macrobius, *Sat.* vi. 9, long ago suggested that the lost part of that work which dealt, according to the promise in *Sat.* i. 24, § 17, with Virgil's augural lore, might be embodied in John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*, i. 12, 13. This may be so; but there seems still more reason to suppose that certain fragments of the lost portions of the *Saturnalia*, perhaps from that which intervened between the abrupt ending of iii. 12, where Virgil's pontifical science is being discussed, and the abrupt beginning of iii. 13, where the luxury of feasts is the subject of discourse, are to be found in *Polier.* viii. 7, a chapter almost wholly borrowed from Macrobius. That this has not (to my knowledge) been noticed before, may be due to the fact that John appears to be quoting an unknown person called Portunianus. But, as Schaarschmidt in his monograph on John (*Johannes Saresberiensis*, p. 91, n. 2) has pointed out, this is to be considered as a mistake for Postumianus, the narrator of the Saturnalian dialogues to Decius; and, although Postumianus is not an interlocutor in the dialogues themselves, John might, in forgetfulness of this, attribute to him remarks occurring in any part of them. He certainly does so in this very chapter, when he says (Giles, iv. p. 234, Migne, *P.L.* cxcix col. 731 D), *ceterum leges illae ualuipatae seu ualuifragae, licet Portuniani iudicio optimae fuerint, obstinatione tamen luxuriae et uitiorum inuicta concordia, nullo abrogante irritae factae sunt*, quoting Macr. *Sat.* iii. 17, § 13. Now just above this he has said, quoting the same section, *Praeterea Lucius Silla, Lepidus consul, Anius Restio, leges traduntur tulisse cibarias. Sic enim sumptuarias leges Cato appellat.* Then he adds: *Differunt tamen quod cibariae gulam iugulant, sumptuariae altrimodam, ut ait Portunianus, luxuriam cohibent.* This distinction is not drawn in any passage of Macrobius that we have, nor does the word *altrimodus* occur; but the sentence may well come from some lost part of the *Saturnalia*. Again, John goes on to quote the rule of feasting with doors open given in *Sat.* iii. 17, § 1, and to add: *Hoc autem ideo tuto probat Portunianus quia apud populum castigatum et posterioris respectu aureum laudi erat frugalitas, et paupertas non poterat esse contemptui uel rubori. Nec uerendum erat ut ad cenam alienam quispiam inuitatus impudenter irrueret.* (We might perhaps read *haud inuitatus.*) What follows is from *Sat.* i. 7, § 10; iii. 17, §§ 13–17; iii. 16, §§ 12–16; iii. 16, §§ 5–7; iii. 17, § 1. Then after some matter not from Macrobius, John returns (G. viii. p. 238, M. col. 734 c) to him, as it seems, yet not to any passage included in our texts: *Secus egisse Gaium Cesarem pace urbi reformata refert Portunianus; qui, sumptuariae legis insistens uestigio, domum ciuilem potius quam imperatoriam in mensa prima tribus sollennibus pulmentis sine ferculis statuit esse contentam, dum tamen bellaria parentetica pro necessitate aut dignitate personarum et aut exercenda liberalitate aut sollennitate diei primis mensis licuerit inmiscere. Sollennia quidem pulmenta sunt quae in omnes pertranseunt, et a Graecis catholica, hoc est uniuersalia nominantur. Parentetica uero quae ex causa necessitatis aut urbanitatis in praeceptam aliqua ratione ueniunt partem, sic dicta, eo quod sollennibus, id est uniuersalibus, particulariter soleant interponi.* Here we have the words *parentheticus* and *catholicus* used in senses unknown (except from this passage of John) to the dictionaries. So after some sentences, the substance of which is drawn from Macr. *Sat.* ii. 8, § 3; Suet. *Aug.* 76, 87; *Vit.* 13, &c., we have this remark, preceding a quotation from Macr. *Sat.* iii. 13: *Nam et ipse* (sc. Metellus) *famosam, immo infamem fecit cenam et anticenium, uel, ut ait Portunianus, paracenium, tanta instruxit luxuria ut non modo splendorem cenae ciuilis sed etiam Egiptium luxum excederet.* This word *paracenium* does not seem to be known elsewhere. The rest of the chapter is partly drawn from known sources—chiefly from Macr. *Sat.* iii. 13—partly occupied by the account of a luxurious banquet at Canosa, at which John was himself a guest.

CLEMENT C. J. WEBB.

Magdalen College, Oxford.

UNRECORDED USES OF αὐτίκα.

Beside the ordinary temporal uses of αὐτίκα, the Lexicons (Stephanus, Rost and Palm, L. and S.) only recognise the use, found not unfrequently in Plato and Aristophanes, by which a particular instance is introduced to confirm a preceding general statement. Many examples of this are given in Devarius, and in Ruhnken's note on Timaeus. There is however another use to be found in Clemens Alexandrinus, which approaches more nearly to γοῦν and justifies a previous statement, not necessarily by an example, but by reference to some generally recognised fact or principle, with which it is logically connected. Sylburgh in his Index quotes two examples and translates it by *utique*. It is however very common, and it may be well here to put down the instances I have collected in order to ascertain its exact force. I will mention first one or two cases in which the rendering 'for instance' is admissible. *Str.* iv. 573 'Choice and rejection are in accordance with knowledge. Hence it is knowledge not pleasure which is the good, and owing to this we sometimes choose a particular kind of pain, *e.g.* (αὐτίκα) the martyr chooses the pleasure he hopes for by way of the immediate pain'; *Str.* vii. 841 'the heathen make their gods like men, not only in body, but in soul, *e.g.* (αὐτίκα) the barbarians make them savage in disposition, the Greeks gentler but passionate.' vii. 878 τοῦτο μόνον ὁρᾶν βούλεται ὃ προσῆκεν αὐτῷ. αὐτίκα τῶν ἀδελφῶν τὰς ψυχὰς θεωρῶν καὶ τῆς σαρκὸς τὸ κάλλος αὐτῇ βλέπει τῇ ψυχῇ, 'he desires to see that only which becomes him. *For instance,* while he contemplates the souls of his brethren, he beholds even the beauty of the flesh only with the eye of the mind.' So. ii. p. 570.

Now consider the following: (*A*) *Str.* i. 316 ψυχῆς ἔκγονοι οἱ λόγοι· αὐτίκα ('at any rate') πατέρας τοὺς κατηχήσαντάς φαμεν. The fact that we call our instructors by the name of father, is not an *instance* of the general statement that 'words are the offspring of the soul,' though it may be alleged in confirmation of it. *Ib.* 323 μεταδιδόναι τῶν θείων μυστηρίων τοῖς χωρεῖν δυναμένοις συγκεχώρηκεν. αὐτίκα οὐ πολλοῖς ἀπεκάλυψεν ἃ μὴ πολλῶν ἦν, 'he has permitted us to impart the divine mysteries to those who are capable of receiving them. *Certainly* he has not revealed to many what was beyond the capacity of many.' Here αὐτίκα introduces a clause to justify the limitation implied in τοῖς χωρεῖν δυναμένοις. *Ib.* 318 ἄμφω κηρύττουσι τὸν λόγον...τῇ δὲ αἰτίᾳ τοῦ μὴ τὸ βέλτιστον ἑλομένου θεὸς ἀναίτιος. αὐτίκα τῶν μὲν ἐκδανεῖσαι τὸν λόγον ἔργον ἐστὶν, τῶν δὲ δοκιμάσαι καὶ ἤτοι ἑλέσθαι ἢ μή, 'God is not to be blamed; *at any rate* it is the duty of one set to communicate the word, of the others to test it.' *Ib.* 367 φασὶ γὰρ αἴτιον εἶναι κλοπῆς τὸν μὴ φυλάξαντα...ὡς τοῦ ἐμπρησμοῦ τὸν μὴ σβέσαντα...αὐτίκα κολάζονται πρὸς τοῦ νόμου οἱ τούτων αἴτιοι '*any how* this is proved by the fact that such are punished by the law.' *Ib.* ii. 447 ὁ νόμος οὐκ ἐποίησεν ἀλλ' ἔδειξεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν...αὐτίκα ὁ ἀπόστολος γνῶσιν εἶπεν ἁμαρτίας διὰ νόμου πεφανερῶσθαι, 'the law did not cause, but revealed sin. *At any rate* the Apostle said that the knowledge of sin was brought to light by the law.' *Ib.* 462 τὸ ἑκούσιον ἢ τὸ κατ' ὄρεξιν ἐστιν ἢ τὸ κατὰ προαίρεσιν ἢ τὸ κατὰ διάνοιαν. αὐτίκα παράκειταί πως ταῦτα ἀλλήλοις, ἁμάρτημα ἀτύχημα ἀδίκημα, 'the voluntary is that which is done either in accordance with inclination, or with purpose, or with understanding: *at any rate* there is a close connexion between error, mishap, and wrongdoing.' (Or should this come under the following head *B*?) *Ib.* 472 κινδυνεύοντας ἀνεχαίτισε νουθετήσας φόβος· αὐτίκα οἱ περιλειφθέντες...κύριοι κατέστησαν τῶν πολεμίων, (speaking of the Israelites seduced by Midian) 'when they were in danger, fear rebuked them and pulled them up...*at any rate* the survivors defeated the enemy.' *Str.* iii. 540 ('as woman is considered the cause of death owing to her child-bearing, so for the same reason she will be called the author of life') αὐτίκα...ζωὴ προσηγορεύθη διὰ τὴν τῆς διαδοχῆς αἰτίαν, τῶν τε γεννωμένων τῶν τε ἀποθνησκόντων (so Louth for ἁμαρτανόντων) γίνεται... μήτηρ, '*at any rate* Eve was called by a name meaning life, because she brought about the succession of birth and death.' *Ib.* 553 ('Cassianus thinks that the soul is of divine nature to begin with, but that it was rendered effeminate by desire, and descended here to birth and death') αὐτίκα βιάζεται τὸν Παῦλον ἐκ τῆς ἀπάτης τὴν γένεσιν συνεστάναι λέγειν, '*at any rate* he makes Paul say that generation is caused by deceit.' *Str.* iv. 570 (The martyr departs to the Lord with good courage and hears from Him the salutation 'Dear brother' because of the similarity of their life) αὐτίκα τελείωσιν τὸ μαρτύριον καλοῦσιν, *at any rate* they call martyrdom perfection.' *Str.* iv. 574 ('Plutus makes men

blind') *αὐτίκα πρὸς τῶν ποιητῶν τυφλὸς ἐκγενετῆς κηρύττεται*, '*certainly* he is represented as blind from his birth.' *Ib.* 566 *τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν κυρίαν ἔχουσιν οἱ τῶν ὑπομνημάτων στρωματεῖς κατὰ τὴν παλαιὰν ἐκείνην προσφορὰν...αὐτίκα οἱ στρωματεῖς ἡμῶν...σῦκ' ἔλαιον ἰσχάδας μέλι προσοδεύουσι*, '*at any rate*.' *Str.* v. 660 *ἀποκεκαλυμμένως οὐχ οἷόν τε ἦν τὰ τοιαῦτα τῶν χαρισμάτων ἐπιστέλλειν. αὐτίκα τῆς βαρβάρου φιλοσοφίας πάνυ σφόδρα ἐπικεκρυμμένως ἥρτηται τὰ Πυθαγόρεια σύμβολα*, 'it was not possible to set forth such graces without concealment. *At any rate* the allegorical precepts of Pythagoras which are derived from the Hebrew philosophy are most carefully shrouded.' *Str.* vii. 844 *πᾶς ἁγνός ἐστιν ὁ μηδὲν ἑαυτῷ κακὸν συνειδώς. αὐτίκα ἡ τραγωδία λέγει, 'Ορέστα, τίς σ' ἀπόλλυσιν νόσος; ἡ σύνεσις, ὅτι σύνοιδα δεῖν' εἰργασμένος. τῷ γὰρ ὄντι ἡ ἁγνεία οὐκ ἄλλη τίς ἐστιν πλὴν ἡ τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἀποχή. καλῶς ἄρα καὶ 'Επίχαρμός φησι, Καθαρὸν ἂν τὸν νοῦν ἔχῃς, ἅπαν τὸ σῶμα καθαρὸς εἶ. αὐτίκα καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς προκαθαίρειν χρεών φαμεν ἀπὸ τῶν φαύλων δογμάτων.* 'Every one is pure whose conscience is clear. *At any rate* the tragic Orestes witnesses that to be conscious of guilt is a fatal disease. For purity consists in abstaining from sin. It is well said therefore that, if you have your mind pure, your whole body is pure. *Anyhow* we say that we must first cleanse our souls also from evil opinions.' *Ib.* 897 (discussing the meaning of the word *φυσιοῦν*, Clement says it does not imply vanity but a high-minded trust in God, and contempt for the world) *αὐτίκα φησὶν ὁ ἀπόστολος 'καὶ γνώσομαι οὐ τὸν λόγον τῶν πεφυσιωμένων ἀλλὰ τὴν δύναμιν,' εἰ μεγαλοφρόνως τῆς γραφῆς συνίετε*, '*at any rate* the Apostle says "I will know not their word, but their power," *i.e.* whether they have a lofty understanding of the Scripture.' *Protr.* p. 38 ('the demons are always plotting against men and are incapable of benefiting anyone) *αὐτίκα γοῦν ἔχω σοι βελτίονα τῶν ὑμεδαπῶν θεῶν, τῶν δαιμόνων, ἐπιδεῖξαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον* '*at any rate* I can show you that the man comes out much better than the gods in the story of Croesus.' The only example I have from other writers is Plut. *Mor.* p. 1137 D *οὐ δι' ἄγνοιαν ἀπείχοντο ἐν τοῖς Δωρίοις τοῦ τετραχόρδου τούτου· αὐτίκα ἐπὶ τῶν λοιπῶν τόνων ἐχρῶντο, δηλονότι εἰδότες* 'it was not owing to ignorance that they abstained from using this tetrachord in the Dorian mode; *at all events* they used it in the other modes, which shows their acquaintance with it.'

What is the origin of this peculiar use? The word *αὐτίκα* properly means 'on the instant' as *αὐτοῦ* means 'on the spot.' Hence it is employed like *εὐθύς* to introduce a sudden thought with the force of 'to go no further,' 'to take what first comes to hand,' and so is fitly joined with an example, implying that they are so abundant there is no need to spend time in looking for one. As the word *γοῦν*, which originally means 'at any rate,' is narrowed to mean 'for instance,' it is possible that *αὐτίκα* may have received a converse extension of meaning, especially as it is often united with *γοῦν* by Clement (cf. p. 108, 113, 159). More probably however it is a parallel development from the root-meaning.

(*B*) Among the instances of the use of the word by Clement there are some which do not seem to come quite under either of the heads mentioned. Thus *Str.* i. 342, after speaking of the importance of regular training in husbandry, medicine and other pursuits, and showing that an athlete is thought little of without it, C. goes on *αὐτίκα καὶ κυβερνήτην τὸν πολύπειρον ἐπαινοῦμεν.* Here neither the interpretation 'for instance' nor 'at any rate' seems appropriate, as *αὐτίκα* merely continues the series of examples already commenced. Perhaps it may be equivalent to the Latin *jam* 'further.' *Str.* iv. 577 (What is the meaning of the parable of Lazarus, and of the saying no man can serve God and Mammon?) *αὐτίκα εἰς τὴν κλῆσιν τοῦ δείπνου οἱ φιλοκτήμονες κληθέντες οὐκ ἀπαντῶσιν...διὰ τὸ προσπαθῶς κεκτῆσθαι.* Here neither 'for instance' nor 'at any rate' will give a natural meaning to *αὐτίκα*, which, I think, must be translated 'further,' 'again.' *Str.* iv. 633 (God is passionless, without anger and without desire. This is the meaning of the Pythagorean precept that man should be one, as God is one) *αὐτίκα ὁ σωτὴρ διὰ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας συνανῄρει καὶ τὸν θυμὸν τιμωρίας ὄντα ἐπιθυμίαν*, '*further* the Saviour did away with anger by forbidding desire, anger being a desire of vengeance.' *Ib.* 633 *ἡ γὰρ σωφροσύνη ἑαυτὴν ἐπισκοποῦσα καὶ θεωροῦσα ἀδιαλείπτως ἐξομοιοῦται κατὰ δύναμιν θεῷ. αὐτίκα τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἐστιν οὗπερ ἐπ' ἴσης αὐτοῦ τε κύριοί ἐσμεν καὶ τοῦ ἀντικειμένου*, 'self-control constantly surveying and observing itself is made like to God so far as is possible. '*Now* that which is within our power is that in which we are masters alike of the thing and of its opposite.' *Str.* v. 659 (After a quotation from St. Paul on the distinction between the spiritual and the psychical man) *αὐτίκα ὁ ἀπόστολος πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν γνωστικῆς τελειότητος τὴν κοινὴν πίστιν θεμέλιον λέγει*, '*again* the apostle calls ordinary faith the

foundation in contrast to gnostic perfection.' *Ib.* 663 (After quoting sayings of Pythagoras which are taken from the Bible just as a candle is lighted from the sun, Clement proceeds) *αὐτίκα ἐπιτομὴν τῶν περὶ δικαιοσύνης εἰρημένων* Μωϋσεῖ *ὁ Πυθαγόρας πεποίηται, λέγων ζυγὸν μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν,* '*again* P. has given an abstract of the words of Moses about justice in his phrase "not to exceed the balance."' *Ib.* 712 (Plato calls the light of this world night, and the descent of the soul into the body slumber and death; so David says of the Saviour, 'I laid me down and slept, I awaked for the Lord shall sustain me'), *αὐτίκα ὁ αὐτὸς σωτὴρ παρεγγυᾷ γρηγορεῖτε, οἷον μελετᾶτε ζῆν καὶ χωρίζειν τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ σώματος,* '*again* the same Saviour charges us to watch, *i.e.* to practise how to live and to separate the soul from the body.'

(*C*) There are some passages in which *αὐτίκα* is read, where the text seems to me corrupt. Such are *Str.* i. p. 426 (the Apostle used the phrase 'according to that ye are able' because he knew that some had only received milk) *οὐδέπω δὲ καὶ βρῶμα, αὐτίκα οὐχ ἁπλῶς γάλα.* Here I think we must read with Louth *ἢ τάχα* ('not yet allowed meat, perhaps not even milk unconditionally,' *i.e.* unless mixed with water): *αὐτίκα* makes no sense. *Str.* ii. p. 460 *πάθος δὲ...ὁρμὴ ἐκφερομένη καὶ ἀπειθὴς λόγῳ. παρὰ φύσιν οὖν κίνησις ψυχῆς κατὰ τὸν πρὸς λόγον ἀπείθειαν τὰ πάθη, ἡ δὲ ἀπόστασις καὶ ἔκστασις καὶ ἀπείθεια ἐφ' ἡμῖν... διὸ καὶ τὰ ἑκούσια κρίνεται.* [*αὐτίκα καθ' ἓν ἕκαστον τῶν παθῶν εἴ τις ἐπεξίοι, ἀλόγους ὀρέξεις, εὕροι ἂν αὐτά*]. *τὸ γοῦν ἀκούσιον οὐ κρίνεται.* I have elsewhere suggested that the sense requires us to transfer the sentence in brackets after *ἀπειθὴς λόγῳ.* This would give the force of 'at any rate' to *αὐτίκα,* which is meaningless as it stands, but would then justify the preceding words by reference to the fact that each particular passion is an *ἄλογος ὄρεξις. Str.* iv. 566 *Ἐπίχαρμος μέμνασ' ἀπιστεῖν, φησιν, ἄρθρα ταῦτα τῶν φρενῶν. αὐτίκα τὸ μὲν ἀπιστεῖν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ θάνατον φέρει, ὡς τὸ πιστεύειν ζωήν, ἔμπαλιν δὲ τὸ πιστεύειν τῷ ψεύδει ἀπιστεῖν δὲ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ εἰς ἀπώλειαν ὑποσύρει.* Here it seems to me that *αὐτίκα* has no meaning as it stands. If we exchange it with the following *ἔμπαλιν δέ* we should get the sense 'on the contrary to disbelieve the truth brings death...*at any rate* to believe a lie sweeps men to destruction.'

J. B. Mayor.

HORACE, *ODES* I. 28.

It would be useless to recapitulate the difficulties which this ode presents. Editors are ranged into two hostile camps on the question 'Is the ode a dialogue or a monologue?' and among those who favour the view which makes it a dialogue, there is the greatest divergency of opinion as to the verses spoken by each of the dramatis personae. Moreover, as the identity of the speaker or speakers is by no means clear from the ode itself, we can easily sympathise with Wickham, when he pronounces the ode 'not very successful if it be essential to good drama that the dramatic play should be so obvious that most intelligent readers should put the same interpretation on it.'

Would not all difficulties disappear if we suppose that the ode addressed to Archytas ends and is completed at line 20?

These twenty verses I would take to be a meditation by Horace at the grave of the famous philosopher and mathematician. That Archytas was buried seems quite clear from vv. 2-4, for surely '*cohibent pulueris exigui munera*' could not mean 'the want of the gift of a little dust keeps you fast,' as the supporters of the opposite view are forced to take these words (see Page on this ode). The contrast is evidently between the narrow compass of Archytas' tomb and the infinite range of the universe which his mind had once spanned. One would analyse the ode thus:—

vv. 1–6. Archytas, you whose speculation ranged so wide, lie in so narrow a tomb as this.

vv. 7–15. The great of ancient times, Tantalus, Tithonus have all passed away.

vv. 15–20. All men must die, some in war, some by shipwreck, all, young and old alike.

The ode would then end with the sonorous cadence, *nullum | saeua caput Proserpina fugit.*

Up to this all is clear; the *motif* is much as in Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* v. 23–64, where Cicero visits the tomb of the mathematician and philosopher Archimedes:

> 'The sceptre, learning, physic must
> All follow this and come to dust.'

It is only in vv. 21 *sqq.* that the difficulties appear which beset the simplicity of the earlier part of the ode as we have it. We have Archytas decently buried and have moralised over his ashes. But now comes the *nauta* who is entreated to spare a few grains of sand to somebody who, as we saw, cannot be Archytas: to whom then does '*me quoque*' refer? Even supposing that Archytas were not already buried, is it probable that Horace would try to interest us in the chances of burial open to a Greek who died 300 years before?

Now if we assume that vv. 21 *sqq.* are absolutely distinct from vv. 1-20, we shall probably not be far from the mark in taking the second ode to be put in the mouth of a sailor or seafarer drowned in the Adriatic, whose ghost appeals for burial to the *nauta* of v. 23, who, as one exposed to a like risk, may be assumed to be ready to listen to his prayer. Analysed, the ode reads thus:—

vv. 21–22. I, like many others, have been drowned in the Adriatic.

23–25 (to the *nauta*). Sprinkle a few grains of sand over me and so bury me.

25–29. Blessing invoked on the *nauta* if he obeys.

30–34. Penalty invoked if he disobeys.

35–36. The boon can be easily granted.

That an ode may begin with the words '*me quoque*' seems possible from a Greek parallel (Hiller, p. 226, Mackail, p. 257)

καὶ σὲ, Κλεηνορίδη, πόθος ὥλεσε πατρίδος αἴης,
θαρσήσαντα Νότου λαίλαπι χειμερίῃ,

where the second verse is closely apposite (cf. v. 22 of Horace's ode). The whole of the piece from v. 21 seems imitated from a Greek original. It was probably written at about the same time as vv. 1-20, and subsequently the desire to avoid the beginning '*me quoque*,' added to the fact that the scene of the 'second' ode is Apulian, caused the two odes, originally distinct, to be joined together and treated as one. We may note how inartistic it is to separate v. 21 from v. 18 by a generalisation already stated in vv. 15, 16. On any other view vv. 19, 20 are intolerable. On mine, they gather up the threads of vv. 17, 18 and enforce by repeating the sentiment of vv. 15, 16 in a way very characteristic, to mention only one poet, of Sophocles.

With regard to minor points, I would suggest that in v. 3 *latum* should be read for *litus* with B. That Archytas was buried on the seashore is most likely to be a reflex from v. 23 (*arenae*) after the two odes had coalesced. '*Latum parua*' is quite in Horace's manner. The main question, however, lies with the general conception. That Archytas was not drowned and his body buried on the shore of Garganus, we can neither affirm nor deny. But that Horace i. 28 proves anything more than the existence of his grave in that region of Apulia is a proposition hard to believe.

ETHEL A. NAIRN.

διήφυσε.

N 508 *ῥῆξε δὲ θώρηκος γύαλον, διὰ δ' ἔντερα χαλκὸς*
ἤφυσ'· ὁ δ' ἐν κονίῃσι πεσὼν ἔλε γαῖαν ἀγοστῷ.

These two lines are repeated word for word P 314 f.

Ξ 517 *οὗτα κατὰ λαπάρην, διὰ δ' ἔντερα χαλκὸς ἄφυσσε*
ὀμφώσας·
τ 449 *ὁ δέ μιν φθάμενος ἔλασεν σὺς*
γουνὸς ὕπερ, πολλὸν δέ διήφυσε σαρκὸς ὀδόντι
λικριφὶς ἀίξας, οὐδ' ὀστέον ἵκετο φωτός.

The above are the only passages, in which this verb, ἀφύσσω (ἀφύω) is used in connection with the infliction of a wound. Elsewhere it means 'to draw' wine or some other fluid, e.g.:—

ι 204 *οἶνον ἐν ἀμφιφορεῦσι δυώδεκα πᾶσιν ἀφύσσας*
β 349 *Μαῖ', ἄγε δή μοι οἶνον ἐν ἀμφιφορεῦσιν ἄφυσσον.* So 379 ἄφυσσεν.
ι 164 *πολλὸν γὰρ ἐν ἀμφιφορεῦσι ἕκαστος ἠφύσαμεν* (sc. *οἶνον*)
ψ 305 *πολλὸς δὲ πίθων ἠφύσσετο οἶνος.*
Α 598 *οἰνοχόει γλυκὺ νέκταρ ἀπὸ κρητῆρος ἀφύσσων.*

So also frequently in the middle voice:—

Γ 295 *οἶνον δ' ἐκ κρητῆρος ἀφυσσάμενοι δεπάεσσιν | ἔκχεον*

Κ 579 ἀφυσσάμενοι λεῖβον μελιηδέα οἶνον.
Ψ 220 οἶνον ἀφυσσάμενος χαμάδις χέε,
Π 230 ἀφύσσατο δ' αἴθοπα οἶνον
δ 359 ἀφυσσάμενοι μέλαν ὕδωρ.

We may follow Aristarchus and write ἀφυσσόμενος as an epic aor. like ἐβήσετο, but the usual -άμενος seems preferable.

By an easy metaphor we have :—

A 171 ἄφενος καὶ πλοῦτον ἀφύξειν.

and η 285 ἀμφὶ δὲ φύλλα | ἠφυσάμην.

The compound forms of this verb, exclusive of the one with which we are now dealing, are :—

ξ 95 οἶνον δὲ φθινύουσιν ὑπέρβιον ἐξαφύοντες. (Leg. ἐξαφύσαντες.)
τ 388 ψυχρόν, ἔπειτα δέ θερμὸν ἐπήφυσαν. sc. ὕδωρ.

These, so far as the meaning goes, present no difficulty whatever; but the case is somewhat different when we come to inquire how διήφυσε is to be understood. Ebeling (Lex. Hom.) renders διαφύσσω by 'discindo,' following Apoll. Lex. διήντλησεν, διέκοψεν and Et. Mg. διέκοψεν, which is, it appears, considered equivalent to διήντλησεν for this exquisite, but ludicrously insufficient, reason, ὁ γὰρ ἀντλῶν διακόπτει τὸ ἀντλούμενον, 'because the remover of the bilge-water knocks a hole in the vessel.' Of course the meaning ought to be 'drew off' with possibly the additional idea of 'completely' or 'continuously' (v. Liddell and Scott), as in the remaining example of this form, which may now be quoted :—

π 110 καὶ οἶνον διαφυσσόμενον καὶ σῖτον ἔδοντας (Leg. διαφυσσομένους).

But is such a sense tolerable or even possible in our three passages? Dr. Leaf has, I see, on N 509 taken the bull fairly by the horns and explained 'let out like water,' defending this by Δ 526 χύντο χάμαι χόλαδες. This explanation, however, waiving for the moment any objection to it for the particular passage, is obviously not in any degree applicable to τ 450 with πολλὸν σαρκός instead of ἔντερα, nor, I submit, would Homer, if he had entertained such an idea for Ξ 517, have been likely to proceed thus :—

ψυχὴ δὲ κατ' οὐταμένην ὠτειλὴν
ἔσσυτ' ἐπειγομένη,

which would remind us with a difference of Shakespeare's (King Richard II. Act 1, Sc. 1) :—

Sluiced out his innocent soul through streams of blood.

It would be little less than marvellous, if this literal acceptation of ἔντερα διήφυσε even in N 508 f. = P 314 f. were received with more favour now than of old when διέκοψεν was welcomed as a paraphrase. The expression is in fact about as absurd as it is horrible, and, I will add, as erroneous as it is absurd. I would hardly state the case so strongly as this, if I were not of opinion that a remedy is possible and that the true verb, lost from the negligence of the later Greeks, whose regard for the obsolete and even the unfamiliar way severely restricted, may still be recovered from other Homeric passages. As this presumed original differs from the debased vulgate by a single letter only, there need be no great difficulty in supposing that our passages originally stood thus :—

N 508 ῥῆξε δὲ θώρηκος γύαλον, διὰ δ' ἔντερα χαλκὸς
ἤμυσ'· ὁ δ' ἐν κονίῃσι πεσὼν ἔλε γαῖαν ἀγοστῷ.
Ξ 517 οὗτα κατὰ λαπάρην, διὰ δ' ἔντερα χαλκὸς ἄμυσσε
τ 450 πολλὸν δὲ διήμυσε σαρκὸς ὀδόντι.

διήμυσε, 'dilaceravit,' is undeniably appropriate in every instance; in one, τ 450, it is more than appropriate. It is indispensable. That it is a legitimate aorist of δι-ἀμύσσω may be inferred from the parallel :—

ἀφύσσω : ἀφύξω : ἤφυσα
ἀμύσσω : ἀμύξω : ἤμυσα.

That this verb is rare in Homer must be admitted; but is sufficiently established by these passages :—

Τ 284 ἀμφ' αὐτῷ χυμένη λίγ' ἐκώκυε, χερσὶ δ' ἄμυσσε
στήθεα τ' ἠδ' ἀπαλὴν δειρὴν ἰδὲ καλὰ πρόσωπα.
A 233 σὺ δ' ἔνδοθι θυμὸν ἀμύξεις

imitated by Theocritus xiii. 71 χαλεπὰ γὰρ ἔσω θεὸς ἦπαρ ἄμυσσεν.

E 425 *πρὸς χρυσέῃ περόνῃ καταμύξατο χεῖρα ἀραιήν.*

Again in Theocr. vi. 13 *κατὰ δὲ χρόα καλὸν ἀμύξῃ.*

It is observable that the solitary aorist of *ἀμύσσω* that is to be found in the Homeric poems is *καταμύξατο* with *ξ* instead of *σ*, and this fact must be regarded as to some extent adverse to the correction suggested. The objection however need not be considered very serious; for apart from the fact that an original *καταμύσσατο* (duplicato *σ*) may have been doricised or even accidentally assimilated to other Homeric aorists such as *ἐνάριξα, πολέμιξα, ἀλάπαξα*, we have a precisely similar phenomenon as regards the interchange of *ξ* and *σ* in *ἥρπαξα* and *ἥρπασα*, both Homeric, if not in *ἔπαιξα* and *ἔπαισα*.

In conclusion I may mention a further reason for the loss of *ἤμυσα* from our passages over and above the natural tendency of the less known to fail before that which is even a little more familiar —and we have seen that *ἀφύσσω* occurs far more frequently than *ἀμύσσω*. The reason is this. *ἤμυσε* is unfortunately liable to be confused with the similarly spelled aorist of *ἠμύω* (Θ 308 *ὡς δ' ἑτέρωσ' ἤμυσε κάρη*). No doubt the two are distinguishable by the quantity, and in the case of words in common use this would be a sufficient safeguard, but hardly so, when, as in this instance, the later Greeks had to deal with the semi-obsolete, the preservation of which must always have been precarious and uncertain.

T. L. Agar.

TACITUS *AGRICOLA* XXIV.

In the October number of this review (p. 328), Mr. A. Gudeman declares his belief in the theory of Pfitzner that Agricola invaded Ireland. I should like briefly to indicate why this theory seems to me wholly mistaken. Two arguments in chief have been adduced to prove it:—

(1) Pfitzner asserts that a certain legion was sent to Britain for the years 81, 82, and that an expedition to Ireland is the only conceivable reason for its being thus specially sent. The first of these statements is admitted by all competent authorities to be wrong: the second is obviously an arbitrary assumption which is not worth discussion.

(2) Mr. Gudeman says that 'the whole chapter [*Agr.* xxiv.] is unintelligible except on the presumption of an expedition to Ireland.' Now this chapter says a good deal about Ireland; it tells us that Agricola thought about invading the island; it tells us what troops he considered necessary for the enterprise. But it does not tell us that he ever did invade Ireland. It seems to me that the chapter is unintelligible save on the presumption of no expedition.

With respect to the particular passage discussed by Mr. Gudeman, *nave prima transgressus*, I think Mr. Gudeman has underestimated one objection to his otherwise ingenious view. He considers *nave prima* as noun and adjective in agreement and admits that it ought to be *prima nave*. That certainly is the Tacitean order where there is no special emphasis; and it is not merely the Tacitean order. If it were a mere rule made by Tacitus for himself, we might allow him to break it—and, I may say in passing, that from this point of view I demur to emendations like those suggested by Mr. Gudeman on *Agr.* xvii or xxxviii; they assume (contrary to the manuscripts) that Tacitus could never vary from his own rule. But this rule about the noun and adjective is common to nearly all Latin, and no writer would break it without an intelligible reason. With a reason, the rule is broken often enough, both by Tacitus and others, but here there is no reason of rhythm or rhetoric or anything else. I still venture to think that my own explanation of the passage, which neither breaks this rule nor disturbs the text, is satisfactory. However, Mr. Gudeman does not think my explanation even worthy of rejection.

F. Haverfield.

PYLOS—THE ATTACK ON KORYPHASION.—A NOTE.

In a recent controversy on Pylos and Sphakteria in the *Classical Review*, one of the questions raised was as to the identity of the wall which the Peloponnesians proposed to attack with engines (Thuc. iv. 13). I maintained that it was a wall filling up a gap at the north end of the eastern cliff of Koryphasion (Palaeokastro). It was urged against me that it was a wall at the extreme south end of this cliff, coming down to the actual edge of the Sikia Channel. I have pointed out various objections to this view, but there is one which occurred to me the other day, while reading Thucydides' narrative, which I did not urge in my article, but which is, as it seems to me, a very important one.

Thucydides says (iv. 23) that, *after* the Athenians had got command of Navarino Bay, and after, too, they had on the terms of the armistice got hold of the Peloponnesian fleet, the Peloponnesians continued to make attacks upon the wall. It seems practically certain that this wall is the same as that which they proposed to attack with engines. But I venture to maintain that had this wall mentioned been on the shore of the Sikia Channel at the south end of the eastern cliff, attack on it by land would have been impossible with the Athenian fleet in command of that channel. The ships could have sailed close in shore and have attacked the assailants in flank in such a way as to render their position untenable and the attempt hopeless, for it must be remembered that it could not in any case have been more than the extreme end of the cliff on the very edge of the channel itself which would be assailable. How effectively ships could be used against a land force where circumstances permitted of their employment can be seen from the account which Pausanias gives (x. 19, 4) of the way in which the Athenian galleys were used at Thermopylae in defending the pass against the attack of Brennus and his Gauls.

I should not have written this note, were not the point in dispute of considerable importance in the Pylos story.

G. B. Grundy.

A CORRECTION IN *AGAMEMNON* 735.

727 χρονισθεὶς δ' ἀπέδειξεν
ἦθος τὸ πρόσθε τοκήων·
χάριν τροφᾶς γὰρ ἀμείβων
730 μηλοφόνοισιν ἐν ἄταις (?)
δαΐτ' ἀκέλευστος ἔτευξεν—
αἵματι δ' οἶκος ἐφύρθη—
ἄμαχον ἄλγος οἰκέταις,
μέγα σίνος πολυκτόνον·
735 ἐκ θεοῦ δ' ἱερεύς τις ἄτας δόμοις †προσετράφη†.

Heath's conjecture προσεθρέφθη, which most modern editors have permitted to appear in their texts without impugning its claim, cannot be seriously defended. It defies the rules of scientific emendation, and has not the merit of yielding a satisfactory sense (since προς- is pointless). It is quite inconceivable that any scribe should have deliberately changed the metrical προσεθρέφθη into the unmetrical προσετράφη; and it would be equally hard to explain how the same change could have been produced by accidental error. Alive to the impossibility of Heath's reading, Mr. Verrall, in his edition of the *Agamemnon*, proposes and adopts προσετράφθη, which he interprets 'was directed to.' The obvious objection to this lies in the circumstance that προστρέπω is always found in the special sense of *supplication*; and I should have some difficulty in believing that Aeschylus would have used προσ-τρέπω with the literal meaning 'turn to,' unless he wished to make some point by playing on the meaning 'supplicate.' προσετράφθη, if it were in the MSS., would be so unnatural as to invite the emendator's art; as an emendation, it is still harder to acquiesce in.

We have not to go so far to seek for the uniquely appropriate word. The sense required is 'was inflicted upon the house,' and the Greek for 'inflict on' is προστρίβειν. The restored line is:

ἐκ θεοῦ δ' ἱερεύς τις ἄτας δόμοις προσετρίφθη.

The reading of M προσετράφη is a corruption

e contextu; it is all about a *θρέμμα* (cp. *ἔθρεψεν* l. 717, *τροφᾶς* l. 728).

The restoration of *προσετρίφθη* receives some special support from l. 395 of the same play, where the poet is likewise referring to the crime of Paris and Helen:

πόλει πρόστριμμ' ἄφερτον ἐνθείς.

προστρίβω occurs twice in Aeschylus elsewhere: in Prom. 329 *γλώσσῃ ματαίᾳ ζημία προστρίβεται*; and in Eum. 238, *ἀλάστορα.... ἀμβλὺν ἤδη προστετριμμένον τε πρὸς ἄλλοισιν οἴκοις καὶ πορεύμασιν βροτῶν*, where the participle has the double sense of *inflicted* and *worn away by rubbing*. For the use of the 1st Aor. pass. it is enough to refer to *τριφθεῖσα ὕλη* in Thucydides, 2, 77.

J. B. Bury.

THE SUN'S RAYS SHINING UNDEFILED ON FILTH.

This illustration of the principle, 'to the pure all things are pure,' is not uncommon in the later Greek and Latin writers. I do not remember to have seen any collection of texts, and have myself let slip not a few. The following may serve as a beginning. I cannot recover passages in which rulers are praised for keeping an eye on all their subjects, down to the meanest and the worst, even as the sun shines impartial on all things.

Diog. Laert. vi 63 (saying of Diogenes the cynic):

πρὸς τὸν ὀνειδίζοντα ὡς εἰς τόπους ἀκαθάρτους εἰσίοι, Καὶ γὰρ ὁ ἥλιος, ἔφη, εἰς τοὺς ἀποπάτους, ἀλλ' οὐ μιαίνεται.

Orig. c. Cels. vi 73 *οἴεται δὲ ὁ τὸν Στωϊκὸν λόγον ἐκτιθέμενος καὶ μὴ προσποιούμενος τὰ περὶ ἀδιαφόρων μεμαθηκέναι, εἰς μίασμα ἐμβεβλῆσθαι τὴν θείαν φύσιν, καὶ μεμιάσθαι εἴτε γενομένην ἐν γυναικὸς σώματι, ἕως περιπλασθῇ αὐτῇ τὸ σῶμα, εἴτε σῶμα ἀνειληφυῖαν· παραπλήσιόν τι ποιῶν τοῖς οἰομένοις τὰς αὐγὰς τοῦ ἡλίου μιαίνεσθαι ἐν τοῖς βορβόροις καὶ τοῖς δυσώδεσι σώμασι, καὶ μὴ μένειν κἀκεῖ καθαράς.* [Similarly Athan. de incarn. Verbi 17 f. (i. 126 c d, Migne); Macar. hom. 7 § 2 pr. (Migne, patrol. Gr. xxxiv 524 d.); 11 § 13 (553 d); 16 § 3 f. (616 a b); Append. Basil. hom. in s. Christi generationem (ii 602 c, ed. Bened.). To these five references I was led by David Hoeschel's note.]

Aug. de agone Christiano § 20 (vi. 245 a, ed. Bened.) nec eos audiamus, qui non verum hominem suscepisse dicunt Filium Dei, neque natum esse de femina, sed falsam carnem et imaginem simulatam corporis humani ostendisse videntibus. nesciunt enim quomodo substantia Dei administrans universam creaturam inquinari omnino non possit: et tamen praedicant istum visibilem solem radios suos per omnes faeces et sordes corporum spargere, et eos mundos et sinceros ubique servare.

Hier. ep. 120 ad Hedibiam c. 11 (i 845 c d, ed. Ven. 1765, 4to.): nec hoc mirandum de Apostolo, cum etiam de Domino legerimus: *ecce hic positus est in ruinam et in resurrectionem multorum in Israel.* . . . solisque radios tam munda loca excipiant quam immunda, et sic in floribus quomodo in stercore luceant: nec tamen solis radii polluuntur. sic et Christi bonus odor, qui numquam mutari potest nec suam naturam amittere, credentibus vita est, incredulis mors.

John E. B. Mayor.

THE POEMS OF BACCHYLIDES.

The Poems of Bacchylides. From a papyrus in the British Museum. Edited by F. G. Kenyon. [Printed by order of the Trustees of the British Museum, 1897. Demy 8vo, lii. 247 pp. 5*s.* nett.]

When it became known early in the year that a volume of papyrus had been discovered containing a considerable number of the poems of Bacchylides, a feeling of expectation akin to that experienced in 1891 on the announcement of the new *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία*, was aroused in the scholars of this and other countries. That in Bacchylides a notable rival of Pindar was added to our store of Greek poetry; that from 107 lines (many of little interest from our ignorance of the context), which some months ago were all that we had of this poet, at the present time 'about 1,070 are either perfect or admit of satisfactory restoration' (p. xxiii.), while of these one ode alone (V.) contains 200; that, moreover, fourteen centuries had passed since Bacchylides was last read in such a form as we have him, all these were facts which justified the eagerness displayed for further information since the first announcement of

the British Museum Trustees. The fact that the first editor was to be Mr. Kenyon was a sufficient guarantee, to those who could appreciate the ability shown in his earlier work of the excellence of its successor. The latter now lies before us: and it may safely be said that Mr. Kenyon has confirmed his high reputation. His task indeed was easier than before. The 'fine uncial hand of good size' (p. xvii.) would present no such difficulties in deciphering as the crabbed minuscule of the Aristotle, with the additional complication of the number of scribes. Also, in establishing the text of Bacchylides, where reconstruction or conjectural emendation found legitimate scope, the editor had the assistance (p. lii.) of such scholars as Prof. Jebb, Prof. Palmer, Prof. Blass, and Dr. Sandys. The advantage gained by the collaboration of the first-mentioned scholar in particular may be studied in the apparatus criticus. Perhaps the most remarkable circumstance in the history of the Aristotle was the wealth of resource with which the scholars of this country treated from every point of view the problems presented; and the same may be said of the Bacchylides.

The present is hardly the occasion for discussing the merit of Bacchylides as a poet. I find myself, however, in general agreement with the editor (pp. xliii. *sq.*). The final verdict on Bacchylides will probably be flattering. He suffers by comparison with Pindar; he offends at first by certain mannerisms such as the keeping up of epithets often commonplace; but he is excellent in narrative, and he expresses the simpler emotions with dignity and grace. The poems numbered v., xvii., xviii., are of special interest.

Mr. Kenyon does not claim finality for his text. There are a number of passages where an emendation may yet be made which will displace the suggestions here adopted, although the editor has been slow to admit alterations for which a considerable amount of evidence was not forthcoming. One good principle he has adopted: that of excluding from his text any reading which involved a change in any part of a mutilated passage; even when, as at xvii. 86, a practically certain emendation is thus excluded. Again, it is impossible to regard as certain all the restorations proposed where the text presents *lacunæ*. Continued study of the poems may lead to more definite results in matters of detail; but, in the main, future editors of Bacchylides will have few textual problems to grapple with. I proceed to discuss some passages where the editor's text or notes do not satisfy me.

Ode i. vv. 1 *sqq.*

Mr. Kenyon says of vv. 1–12: 'The drift of these mutilated lines can hardly be restored with certainty: but apparently ll. 1–8 refer to Melas himself.' I shall first propose my restoration of the passage and then offer some remarks.

πολ[ὺ πρῶτον, τῶ]ν βαθυ-
δείελο[ν ἔξισ]μεν γένος,
ἔπλε[το καρτε]ρόχειρ
Ἀργεῖο[ς ἄγαλμα], λέοντος
θυμὸ[ν ἔχων], ὅποτε
[ζ]αχρεῖ[ος ἐξέ]λθοι μάχας,
ποσσὶ[ν τ' ἐλα]φρὸ[ς, π]ατρίων
τ' οὐκ [ἀπείρατος π]αλῶν.

I have adopted in vv. 3, 7, and 8 restorations already in the text: save that in v. 7 ἐλαφρὸς appears instead of ἐλαφροῖς. The nom. sing. seems necessary, even if it will not fill the vacant space quite so accurately. In v. 8 ἀπείρατος is Prof. Jebb's. From the editor's silence on the epithet βαθυδείελο[ν] I am emboldened to say that it means 'very famous,' lit. 'very conspicuous,' much as εὐδείελος, only metaphorical. Bacchylides is fond of compounds with βαθυ- as the first part.

πολὺ πρῶτον goes with ἄγαλμα, and τῶν is the relative. ἔξισμεν gains in probability from the editor's statement that the letter before M in the papyrus 'is perhaps Σ,' that is, apparently, C. That ὅποτε should be read as one word, not divided as in the text, seems clear: while in the ΟΛΟΙ of the following line must be concealed a trace of the optative 'of frequency.' The right reading of v. 6 is very difficult to ascertain. The MS. (*v.* critical note) has a vowel at the beginning, making hiatus with the final of ὅποτε. This is very rare (*v.* note on x. 15, p. 87) in the poems. But the meaning is the chief difficulty of ΑΧΡΕΙ: 'when he came forth to battle' must be the general sense, and ζαχρεῖος μάχας, meaning 'eager for battle,' is possible, cf. Theocritus xxv. 6. I had thought of ΧΡΕΙ[Α ΝΙΝ ΕΚΚ]ΑΛΟΙ ΜΑΧΑC, but this does not agree with ΑΧΡΕΙ or with ΟΛΟΙ. For ἐξέλθοι it may be said that it involves the common confusion of Θ and Ο, though transposition complicates the question. The accent on ΟΙ in the MS. is not a serious objection (*v.* note on iii. 30, p. 21). Finally, ἐξέλθοι satisfies the metre of the antistrophic v. 14.

In the light of this restoration we may now approach Ode ii. vv. 4–5, where is to be found the rest of the evidence for the name of the athlete whose praises form the subject of these two odes. Mr. Kenyon reads here :—

ὅτι Μ[έλ]ας θρασύχειρος Ἀρ-
γεῖο[ν ἄ]ρατο νίκαν.

Considering the difficulty of Ἀργεῖον νίκαν (see his note), and the passage in the first ode just discussed, where no proper name other than Ἀργεῖος could well find a place, it is probable that the name of the athlete was Ἀργεῖος, not Μέλας : that Μ[ ]ΑC of v. 4 is to be restored as ΜΕΓΑC : cf. *μέγαν Θησέα* (xvii. 98) which may remove Mr. Kenyon's scruples as to the epithet : and lastly that Ἀργεῖος is to be read, with Blass and Sandys, in both passages.

Ode i. vv. 42–3.

I am inclined to read, with Prof. Jebb, *τόνδ' ἔλαχεν τιμάν*, neglecting the punctuation of the MS. But the *τί μάν ;* of the text has a tone of good-humoured contempt which will lead some to prefer it.

Ode ii. 8. *Ἐυξαντίδα νᾶσον.* Mr. Marindin has suggested to me a reference to Strabo p. 487, where it is stated that Nestor, on his return from Troy, founded a temple to Athene Nedusia (of Nedon in Elis cf. Strabo p. 360) at Poeessa in Ceos. This, added to the fact that one of the founders of Miletus was the Pylian Neleus, forms a link between Pylus Miletus and Ceos like that established by the editor on p. 195.[1]

Ode iii. vv. 21–22. *θεὸν θεόν τις | ἀγλαιζέτω γὰρ, ἄριστον ὄλβον.* The *γαρ* is exceedingly weak, and a 2nd person imperative seems required : 'whoever thou art, give God the glory.' *ἄριστον ὄλβον* also is unsatisfactory, nor is *ἄριστον ὄλβῳ* any more suitable. Prof. Butcher, who has very kindly helped me with his advice throughout the preparation of this review, suggests

θεὸν θεόν τις | ἀγλάϊζε, δώτορ' ἄριστον ὄλβων.

ΤΟΡ and ΓΑΡ are very close, and the corruption of ΟΛΒΩΝ to ΟΛΒΟΝ would be rapid after the disappearance of ΔΩΤΟΡΑ. It would perhaps be over refining to say that the transition from ΑΓΛΑΙΖΕΔΩ to ΑΓΛΑΙΖΕΘΩ is less violent than that postulated in the text.

Mr. Marindin would read *ἀγλάϊζε, θεῷ γὰρ ἄριστος ὄλβων*, giving a causative sense to *θεῷ*.[2]

Ode iii. 48. Read Ἀβροβάταν (a proper name) with Prof. Palmer.

iii. 49. *ξύλινον δόμον* = funeral pyre might have had a note, with a reference to Pindar's *ξύλινον τεῖχος* (Pyth. 3, 67). The whole passage should be compared, esp. *οἰκτροτάτῳ θανάτῳ* with v. 52 of Bacchylides.

iii. 60. The spelling *τανισφύροις* of the MS. should hardly be introduced into the text : (cf. Stephanus, *Thesaurus* s.v.)

iii. 63. The sentence which begins *ὅσοι μὲν* ends with the word *πέμψαι* v. 66. *βροτῷ* (v. 66) for which we should perhaps read *βροτῶν* (cf v. 109), goes with *πάρεστιν* of v. 67 : the infinitive dependent on *πάρεστιν* lies hid in [ ]ειν : perhaps [*αἰνε*]*ειν*, though the editor reports a Γ before *ειν* : cf. however xiii. 166 ff. From *ὅστις* to *πιαίνεται* is parenthetical, and in v. 69 perhaps [*Δαμοκ*]*λη* should be restored : while the epithet of *Διὸς* in v. 70 may be [*ξειν*]*ιου*, but is more probably some local title of the God, familiar to the poet as a native of Ceos. For the deprecatory tone of vv. 67–68 cf. xiii. 166 ff. above quoted. Is Damocles then the trainer of Hiero's horses?

iii. 76–7. Prof. Jebb's [*Ἀπόλλων*] and [*ὁ βουκόλος*] are worthy of being received into the text.

iii. 88. *πολιὸν π*[*αρ*]*έντα γῆρας.* I am disposed to read *παρέντα* with Prof. Jebb, but in the sense of 'passing over,' 'omitting,' not as Prof. Jebb 'having seen it go by.' This meaning seems scarcely so suitable, and barely borne out by the parallels quoted, both of which refer to seeing youth, not old age, go by. I question whether, in the sense in which Plato uses the word, it is possible for any one *γῆρας παριέναι.*

iii. 90. *μινύθει* with *ῠ* is indeed a novelty. Is it impossible th at the form *μινύνω* posited by Mr. Purser (on v. 151 p. 54) should have been used intransitively (as *μινύθω* is used in both ways)? Its displacement by the common form *μινύθω* would be almost certain. No corruption of a deeper kind seems at all probable.

iv. 19. *παντοδαπῶν.* This word, a formation like *ποδαπὸς* (cuias) meant originally 'from all lands,' and was then generalized. The primitive meaning will suit the present

[1] [It may be added, that it also explains why Bacchylides (if we accept Professor Palmer's excellent suggestion in Ode xi. 120) speaks of the founders of Metapontum as his ancestors. G. E. M.]

[2] [Professor Butcher's proposal makes a much better line. My only difficulty in regarding it as altogether preferable to my own is that it is hard to conceive a scribe altering so common a word as *δώτορ'* into *θωγαρ*, whereas he might conceivably write the monosyllabic *θεῷ* as *θω*. G. E. M.]

passage, for Hiero, as Mr. Kenyon says, had won victories at Olympus, Pytho and Thebes. I had thought of *παντοδροπῶν*, another *ἅπαξ εἰρημένον*, comparing Horace's undique decerptam—oliuam, but there does not seem to be room for three letters between Ο and Π.

v. 26. *δυσπαίπαλα* is a strange epithet of *κύματα*. In pre-Christian poetry it is applied elsewhere only to the glens of mountains. *δυσπέμφελα* (v. L. and S.) is much more appropriate, and may be worth consideration, perhaps as *δυσπέμπελα*, cf. *εὐπέμπελος*.

v. 67. Prof. Jebb's *ἀργεστὰς* ought, I think, to be read.

v. 80. For *γελανώσας*, a strange formation, and one hardly warranted by Pindar's *θυμῷ γελανεῖ*, Mr. Marindin suggests with much probability *γαλανώσας* (: *γαλάνη* = *γαλήνη*).

v. 107. For *πλημυρῶν* read probably *πλημύρων* and cf. Steph., *Thes.* s.v. *πλημμύρειν*.

v. 151. I have referred on iii. 90 to Mr. Purser's view, which is probably right: certainly a finite verb seems wanted rather than the adverb *μίννυθα* even with *ἦν*.

v. 194. *ὅπ[ασσαν]* should be read with Prof. Jebb for *ἔπ[λησαν]*.

vi. 4 (*note*). The translation which Mr. Kenyon rejects is probably correct: that which he approves is impossible. 'Lachon obtained great glory on account of the praises of Ceos sung by the young men': the praises being Lachon's exploits.

vii. 1. While agreeing with Mr. Kenyon that *Ἡμέρα* is probably meant, I would parallel the first line by Frag. 66 (40 Bergk) *Ἑκάτα δᾳδοφόρε, Νυκτὸς μελανοκόλπου θύγατερ.*

vii. 7. *ἐρισταλκὲς* (*σθένος*). Read *ἀριστ-* ταλκές.

viii. 7. The expression *ἐν ἅλικι χρονῷ* surely requires a note. *ἅλιξ* is apparently equivalent to *τηλικοῦτος*, a transition similar to that seen in aequalis.

viii. 10. With *κεραυνεγχὲς* might have been compared Pindar's *εγχεικέραυνος*.

ix. 10. *νικάσπιδες* is a very strange compound. 'With victorious shields,' the meaning preferred by the editor, seems a rather infelicitous epithet, as the victory is presumably won by the offensive, not the defensive, weapons. It is at least curious that at xi. 62 we have *χαλκάσπιδες ἡμίθεοι*, not indeed of Adrastus, but with Argos in the immediate vicinity. Given Χ in the lacuna (and there seems to be space for it) the strokes of ΝΙ would equally well give ΑΛ, thus giving ΧΑΛΚΑϹΠΙΔΕϹ ΗΜΙΘΕΟΙ in both passages.

ix. 13. *ἀωτεύοντα*, in view of the striking parallel quoted in the note, seems the best suggestion for the corrupt ΑϹΑΓΕΥΟΝΤΑ. At the same time, *ἀωτεύειν*, like *ἀωτεῖν*, commonly means 'to sleep': and it may be that this is the sense here. Prof. Butcher suggests *ἀθαλεύοντα* (: *ἀθηλὴς* weaned).

ix. 46. There can be little doubt that *καθ' ὑψιπύλου Τροίας ἕδος* should be read with Prof. Jebb. The difficulty in the mythology might be lessened if we could interpret *σᾶς γενεᾶς* loosely as 'the daughters of thy wife Harmonia.' It is not quite certain that Bacchylides regarded Thebe and Aegina as daughters of Ares: for *κυανοπλοκάμου θήβας πόλιν* may be a periphrasis for Thebes, of which the *ἀγυιατίδες* were Semele and her sisters. But the introduction of Thebe is strange if she is not a daughter of Harmonia: contrary to the usual form of the legend, which makes her the daughter of the river-god Asopus and Metope.

ix. 86. Perhaps *κάλλιστον εἰ[ρήνας ἄγαλμα]*.

ix. 95–6. Perhaps

π]αύροις
ἀν]δρ[ασιν πάντως ὁρᾶται] τὸ μέλλον.

x. i. Perhaps

σὺ γὰρ [αἰὲν ἐν ἀνθρώποις πεδ]οιχνεῖς
ἆθλα:

or *ἐπ' ἀνθρώποις* cf. vii. 9.

x. 10. *νασιώταν* seems to satisfy the conditions best. I had thought that the name of the athlete might lurk in these lines, and tried both v. 10 and v. 11 with that in view, impelled by the neighbourhood of *τεᾶν ἀρετᾶν* (v. 13). But I now think that v. 11 begins *ἤγειρε θ' ἵνα κτλ.* The letter before ΕΙ in the first word, which Mr. Kenyon reads now as Λ now as Χ, may be Γ. If *ἐκείνησεν ...ἤγειρε θ'* seems prosaic, the fault lies in *ἐκείνησεν*.

x. 45 *sqq.* Mr. Kenyon, usually a stout champion of the punctuation in the MS., here abandons it without reason. We should read

τὸ μέλλον
δ' ἀκρίτους τίκτει τελευτάς
πᾷ τύχα βρίσει.

πᾷ...βρίσει enforces *ἀκρίτους*. What meaning *παῖ, τύχα βρίσει* can have, the ode not being addressed to a boy, I fail to realise. It is moreover open to question whether ΠΑΙ could be *παῖ*. At xiii. 62 that vocative is written ΠΑΙ without any line above.

xi. 11. *[κατέχ]ουσι* seems better than

[κελαδ]οῦσι: cf. xiii. 129 *sq.* There is no accent over ΟΥ.

xi. 52. Mr. Kenyon prints εὐρυβία, taking it with Διός, but the MS. has clearly εὐρυβίᾳ with πλούτῳ. Cf. xvi. 31 φθόνος εὐρυβίας.

xi. 101. ἱππώκεος. A reference to Herodotus lib. i. *ad fin.* might be added.

xiii. 50. Mr. Kenyon puts a period after αἰνεῖ, but surely the subject to αἰνεῖ is contained in the following lines.

xiii. 126 *sqq.* I suggest [κλάζ]ντες ὑπερφίαλον

[μέγιστ' ἐθάρσουν]
[Τρῶ]ες ἱππευταὶ κυανώπιδας ἐκ
[φλέξασιν ἐνσέλμους] νέας
[παύραις χόρον εἴλα]πίνας τ' ἐν
[ἁμέ]ρ[α]ις ἕξειν θεύδματον πόλιν.

ἐκφλέξασιν = when they had burnt. I adopt κλάζοντες, τρῶες, and εἰλαπίνας from Mr. Kenyon.

xiii. 160. For ἅμα δή, which I do not understand, perhaps θαμὰ δή, space permitting.

xiii. 166. For θερσοεπὴς I would prefer ἀθερσοεπὴς, to which the punctuation points rather (*v.* note), but I would connect the first part of the word with ἀθερίζειν. Prof. Butcher plausibly conjectures ἀτερψιεπὴς (cf. *infra.* 197 τερψιπεῖς).

xiii. 189. Perhaps φοινικοκραδέμνοις τε Μούσαις rather. The poet trusts in his hope and the Muse's help.

xiii. 190. Perhaps τὰν δε[χάνορ' ἑστίαν].

xiii. 195. ἐτύμως may mean 'true to her name,' as Dr. Verrall holds for Aeschylus.

xiv. 22. Πυρρίχον may be supported by v. 182 ff.

xv. 5–6. Perhaps 'Οδυσσεῖ
[Λαρτιάδᾳ Μενελα]ῳ τ' Ἀτρείδᾳ βασιλεῖ.

xvi. 34. With ῥοδόεντι of a river cf. ἀνθεμόεντι Ἕβρῳ v. 5.

xvii. A reference to Baumeister *Denkmäler*, Band iii. p. 1793 (the Euphronius vase), might have been given with advantage.

xvii. 38. Νηρηΐδες, but *infra* v. 102–3 Νηρῆος ὀλβίου κόρας. There cannot well be any such difference in this ode, at least between these expressions, as Ammonius refers to (Bergk 10).

xvii. 102 (*note*). Philological reasons would surely preclude the possibility of a form Νερῆος = Νηρέος, which seems to be hinted at.

xvii. 112. Prof. Jebb's εἰανὸν (and πορφύρεον) may be accepted. Mr. Marindin points out that ἀμφὶ γυίοις v. 124 is only consistent with the mention of a garment here. He suggests also ἀμφέβαλε ταινίαν as a *possible* alternative.

xix. 15. For the corrupt TIHN. Mr. Marindin has a very attractive suggestion TIEN, another Doric Infinitive (cf. line 25 and note). He would take γέρας τίεν together, comparing Aesch. *Ag.* 706 μέλος τιόντας, and regard τίεν as epexegetical of ἔξοχον γέρας. This would possibly not necessitate the removal of the stop (middle point) after γέρας: cf. xiii., iii. where this stop is equivalent to a comma.

Frag. 7, 5. πο]λυαμπελ[ον? In vi. 5 ἀμπελοτρόφον is applied to Κέον.

J. A. NAIRN.

NICOLE'S FRAGMENTS OF MENANDER.

Le Laboureur de Ménandre: fragments inédits sur papyrus d'Égypte, déchiffrés, traduits et commentés par Jules Nicole, Professeur à l'Université de Genève. [Geneva; Georg & Co., 1898 (*sic*)]. 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE announcement, which appeared in some of the daily papers a few weeks ago, that a play of Menander had been discovered in a papyrus manuscript, must have raised the hopes of many scholars. It has always been surprising that the discoveries of papyri, which have been so plentiful of late years, should have included no portion of Menander, probably the most popular of authors in the Alexandrian and subsequent ages. It has been suggested that the cause is to be found in the hostility of the Christian Church; but the chapter of accidents which has given us Aristophanes and Herodas and certain parts of the Anthology and Petronius and Martial can hardly have owed much to ecclesiastical favour. In any case the influence of the Church would have been very ineffectual before the fourth century; and all the literary papyri which have yet been brought to light have belonged to earlier dates than this. The non-appearance of Menander must be put down to an accident—an accident which any day may repair. Unfortunately it is not repaired by the discovery, interesting though it be, which has now been made public by Prof. Nicole.

Prof. Nicole's discovery, which is published in a convenient pamphlet of some eighty pages, consists of two fragments of papyrus, the largest about 6 inches by 7,

the other slightly less, and containing writing on each side. Traces of writing on the margin of one of the fragments seem to indicate that the manuscript was a roll and not a codex; and if Prof. Nicole is right in assigning it to about the second century, the probabilities are strongly in favour of this conclusion, though opisthograph papyri, in which the *verso* holds the continuation of the text on the *recto*, are far from common. Prof. Nicole gives no facsimile, but his description of the hand as a small, neat uncial, slightly sloping, in the case of three columns, and a larger, upright uncial in the fourth, suits the date named, or the beginning of the third century. The text is readily identifiable as that of the Γεωργός of Menander, through the presence of two of the known quotations from that play (fragg. 96 and 98, Kock); and what we have of it consists of four mutilated columns, containing portions of ninety lines in various states of preservation.

The first column (in the order in which Prof. Nicole prints them, though he finally comes to the conclusion that probably it is in fact the second) contains a monologue by a young man of which the most perfect portion runs as follows (according to Prof. Nicole's restoration):—

[εἶμ'· ἀπο]λιπὼν δὲ τὸν γάμον τὴν φιλτάτην
[Φίλιννα]ν ἀδικήσαιμ' ἄν· οὐ γὰρ εὐσεβές.
[κό]πτειν δὲ μέλλων τὴν θύραν ὀκνῶ πάλαι·
[οὐ]κ οἶδα γὰρ τὸν ἀδελφόν; εἰ νῦν ἐξ ἀγροῦ
[ἐ]νθάδ' ἐπιδημεῖ, πάντα προνοεῖσθαι μ' ἔδει.
[ἀ]λλ' ἐκποδὼν ἄπειμι καὶ βουλεύσομαι
τοῦτ' αὖθ', ὅπως δεῖ διαφυγεῖν με τὸν γάμον.

In lines 4 and 5 of this passage a different punctuation would perhaps be an improvement:—

οὐκ οἶδα γὰρ τὸν ἀδελφόν, εἰ νῦν ἐξ ἀγροῦ
ἐνθάδ' ἐπιδημεῖ· πάντα προνοεῖσθαι μ' ἔδει.

The young man, hesitating on the doorstep, and anxious to know the exact situation of affairs inside before venturing in, says 'I don't know if my brother has come in from the country. I ought to know everything before I go in.' με δεῖ would perhaps be preferable, but the papyrus has a mark of elision after the μ.

The second column, written on the *verso* of the first, and perhaps following immediately upon it, contains a scene between a woman and a slave, who brings her news of her husband, a farmer in the country:—

Α(γγελος). πρώην ποτ' ἐν ταῖς ἀμ[πέλοις]
σκ[ά]πτων διέκοψε τὸ σκέλος Χρή-
σ[ιπ]πος.
Γ(υνή). ὦ
τάλαιν' ἐγώ.
Α. θάρρει, τὸ πέρας δ'ἄκουέ μου.
ἀπὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἕλκους, ὡς τριταῖον
ἐγένετο,
βουβὼν ἐπήρθη τῷ γέροντι, θέρμα τε
ἐπέλαβεν αὐτὸν καὶ κακῶς ἔσχεν
πάνυ.
Γ. ἀλλ' ἐκκορη[θ]είης σύ γ', οἷα
τἀγαθὰ
ἥκεις ἀπαγγέλλων.
Α. σιώπα, γράδιον.
ἐνταῦθα χρείας γενομένης αὐτῷ
τινος
κ...εμ.νος, οἱ μὲν οἰκέται καὶ βάρ-
β[αρ]οι
'ἐκ[νλ]ισ' ἐκεῖνος· ἔστιν οἰμώζειν
μ[όν]ον·'
κ[ἄλι]πον ἅπαντες· ὁ δὲ σὸς υἱὸς
Ἐχεμ[ένης]
νομίσας ἑαυτοῦ πατέρ' ἀνο[ρθῶσ]αι...
ἤλειφεν ἐξέτριβεν ἀπέν[ι]ζεν φαγεῖν
προσέφερε παρεμύθευ', ὃ πάνυ φαύ-
λως ἔχει,
[σκ]άζ[ο]ντ' ἀνέστησ' αὐτὸν ἐπι-
μελούμενος.

In the last line it may be suggested that καὶ ζῶντ' would apparently suit the traces in the MS., as given in Prof. Nicole's transcript, and would give a more satisfactory sense.

This fragment, which continues for some lines further, is the largest continuous passage preserved in the new papyrus. The third column is in worse condition, and is chiefly remarkable for containing frag. 96 (Kock) in a form so different from that in which it is quoted by Stobaeus as to lead Prof. Nicole to suggest the hypothesis of two editions of the play. The fourth column is still more mutilated, and needs so much restoration as to make any but a quite conjectural text impossible. For the details of it, readers must be referred to Prof. Nicole's pamphlet.

Prof. Nicole has not confined himself to a mere printing of the text of his papyrus, nor even to a restoration of its mutilated lines. He has taken the materials provided by the papyrus, combined them with the already extant quotations from the drama, and endeavoured therefrom to reconstruct the plot and outline of the whole play. The result is given in the last twelve pages of his pamphlet, in which these materials (amounting in all to 115 lines) are mar-

shalled into ten skeleton scenes, mostly only of a few lines each. Prof. Nicole has shown extreme ingenuity in his task; but in fact he is trying to make bricks with very insufficient straw. A hundred and fifteen scattered lines, some preserved on account of the γνῶμαι contained in them and others by the mere chance survival of two scraps of papyrus, are hardly likely to give a good idea of the course of a play which may have contained fifteen or seventeen hundred lines; and it so happens that none of our fragments reveals much of the action of the piece. Prof. Nicole's reconstruction, as he is the first to admit, is a tissue of hypotheses, of which the most that one can say is that they may possibly be right, but that (judging from the general fate of modern conjectures when confronted with authentic evidence from manuscripts) they are more probably wrong. To say this is to imply no reflection upon Prof. Nicole. He has made the most of the materials which fortune has granted him; he has given what may be trusted to be an accurate reproduction of what the manuscript contains; he has done his best to supply its omissions, with such success as the *data* admit of; and if he has not been able to give us back a complete comedy of Menander, we may be certain that no one regrets it more than he does himself. Meanwhile we must take what we can get and be grateful, even if our gratitude commonly takes the form of a lively expectation of favours to come. And if there be favours to come, they can be in no better hands than those of Prof. Nicole.

F. G. Kenyon.

HEINZE'S LUCRETIUS.

T. Lucretius Carus de rerum natura. Buch III. Erklärt von Richard Heinze. Leipzig, Teubner, 1897. 4 M.

This book is one of the new series of scientific commentaries now being issued by Teubner. It is large octavo in size, and contains 206 pages: the *Vorwort* occupies 6 pages, the text 30 and the commentary 168. Below the text are printed all variant readings from the principal manuscripts, and accepted emendations, with the name of the critic.

The text is very conservative; Heinze marks as corrupt *spicarumque* 198, *mens* 239, *quaedam que* 240, *sitas* 306, *turbat* 493, *atque* 531, *utrumque* 658, *magnis* 962. In 58 he prints *eliciuntur et eripitur—manare*, 319 *video*, 420 *vita*, 820 *vitalibus*, 173 *suavis, et in terra;* and retains 412, 685, 743, 806–818. In marked contrast to Brieger and even Munro, Heinze allows lacunae only after 97 and 619, and rejects all transpositions proposed in recent years. For *manare* of 58 he suggests *mala re;* in 75 he reads *maceret invidia: ante;* 82 *timorem. hunc...suadet*, 194 *constat*, 337 *propterea*, 358 *cum expellitur aevo*, 377 *sunt, dumtaxat*, 394 *sis*, 415 *alioquist*, 433 *feruntur*, 444 *magis incohibensquest*, 493 (probably) *turbat, agens anima spumas, ut*, 535 *diducere*, 574 *in se—in eos*, 596 *corpore*, 658 (probably) *utramque*, 694 *subitis e*, 742 *cervis*, 747 *quoque*, 917 *torrat*, 969 *antehac*, 1019 *torquetque*. Some of these are new conjectures. It is interesting to note the increasing conservatism of Lucretian scholars since Lachmann; Munro restored the reading of the manuscripts in several cases and Brieger in still more; Heinze has not only surpassed both in retaining the reading of the codices, but has declined to follow Brieger in discovering gaps in the text, and has wholly abandoned the theory set forth by Lachmann that many passages interrupt the continuity of the argument: hence in Heinze's text there is no such bracketing as occurs in the editions of Bernays, Munro, and particularly Brieger.

The introduction to the commentary is a careful exposition of the Epicurean theory of the soul and mind, with extensive citation of Greek authorities; especially the authors contained in Usener's *Epicurea*, and the fragments of Diogenes of Oinoanda. In the commentary proper the treatment is thorough; not only the development of the argument is carefully noted, but there is almost excessive quotation of Greek authorities on philosophical principles advocated, or, by implication, opposed by Lucretius. Little attention is given to the Latinity except in the discussion of variant readings or conjectures; and the vision of the editor is rather directed to Greek than to Latin literature, as his main object was, apparently, to set forth plainly the principles discussed by Lucretius. Hence there is little of aesthetic or literary criticism, and the influence of Lucretius on later Roman poets and on modern literature is hardly touched. But an editor who in the pathetic passage

894 *iam iam non domus accipiet te laeta, neque uxor | optima nec dulcis occurrent oscula nati* insists that *uxor* goes with *accipiet* rather than with *occurret* (*occurrent*), because *domus* is distributed into *uxor* and *nati* may well refrain from aesthetic criticism. But no book of Lucretius has ever been edited with the thoroughness which Heinze has shown, and for the understanding of the poet little remains to be done. Naturally in a commentary of such extent there are many statements of opinion with which readers will join issue, and all will not always agree with Heinze in his interpretations. There are remarkably few misprints, as for instance *ne* for *ve* p. 55; and errors in statements of fact are infrequent, as p. 72 when Bockemüller alone is said to defend *suavis* although Lotze and Grasburger had also retained it. On page 129 Heinze says verse 527 *et membratim vitalem* is the only verse in Lucretius where a word ends after two spondees which begin the line; but 4, 1078 *nec constat quid* satisfies the condition, which should have been expressed in different terms.

The editions which are to follow in this series will be eagerly expected. It is fortunate for classical scholarship that there is at least one country in the world where elaborate commentaries can find a publisher.

W. A. Merrill.

University of California.

KAIBEL ON THE *ANTIGONE* OF SOPHOCLES.

De Sophoclis Antigona, scripsit Georgius Kaibel. Göttingen. 1897. Pp. 2–27.

Professor Kaibel has succeeded Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf in the Chair of Greek at Göttingen; and he inherits much of the originality, and perhaps something also of the wilfulness, of that eminent philologer. In this little monograph, written in Latin, he disputes the opinion, which has been current since it was suggested by an *obiter dictum* of Goethe's, that the last *rhesis* of Antigone (Soph. *Ant.* 891–928) has been interpolated by some inferior poet. As I have always maintained the genuineness of the passage, I may be allowed to welcome this able expression of a similar view, and to quote what I wrote on the subject thirty-six years ago: 'Antigone, when brought face to face with death, in utter isolation from human sympathy, comes down from the lofty tone she had assumed in her first answer to Creon, and recognizes the simple fact that it was the strength of her affection which impelled her to defy the law. Her love for Polynices was wonderful, passing the love that could be felt for a husband or a child.' There are several points of detail in Professor Kaibel's paper with which I cannot agree. I see no need of supposing a lacuna after v. 904 (ἐτίμησα seems to me to bear the strain upon it—'It was *indeed* an honour I paid you if considered rightly'), and his interpretation sometimes travels too far beyond the limits of the action: but his main contention seems to me sufficiently made out. He shows the difficulties, some of which were felt by Professor Jebb, of accepting various proposed excisions; he defends the condensation of the language—more like the poet than the interpolator; and he indicates the ground of the error which he combats, viz. a wrong conception of Sophoclean method and of the theme of the Antigone. The tragedy does not turn upon an opposition of abstract principles, ideas or rights, as Hegel thought, but on the conflict of two stubborn personalities. Antigone is not a prophetess declaring the unwritten laws to which she makes her appeal against her judge: but a princess, proudly maintaining the honours of her line against one of an alien house who is infringing them. I could wish that the writer had not said that she would have resisted any other action of the hated Creon. I do not think he dwells enough on the famous words, οὔτοι ξυνέχθειν ἀλλὰ συμφιλεῖν ἔφυν. And he fails to appreciate the justice of Aristotle's remark on the *finesse* of Haemon. But his pages, few as they are, are full of suggestiveness, and while in some particulars his views will bear revision, his main drift deserves respectful consideration.

Lewis Campbell.

A ROMAN PROSOPOGRAPHIA.

Prosopographia Imperii Romani Saec. I., II., III. Consilio et Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Regiae Borussicae. Pars I.: edidit Elimarus Klebs. Pars II.: edidit Hermannus Dessav. Berolini apud Georgium Reimerum. MDCCCLXXXXVII. 44 M.

Now that (to quote the *Praemonitum* of the Academy) the collection of Greek and Roman inscriptions is in a certain sense, and for the moment, complete, it has become possible to use, for purposes of research, the store of matter thus issued and digested. '*Id jam nobis videmur adsecuti esse, ut post messem in horreis conditam manus admoveri possint ad messorum operas secutorias.*' Most of the inscriptions are of little use, if taken one at a time; joined and compared, they will yield much information which can be found nowhere else. Of what value such comparative inquiry may be is abundantly shown by, *e.g.*, Hirschfeld's *Untersuchungen*, and the Academy mentions several large tasks of investigation which ought to be undertaken on the material now ready to hand. It insists that this material must include coins, papyri, and authors as well as inscriptions; combination of all these sources can alone give '*doctrina pendens non a copiarum specie, sed ab ipsa rerum cognitione.*' These tasks, or others like them, will, it is confident, be carried out, not by the Academy itself, but by individual *viri docti:* but the Academy judges it well to issue a specimen of the kind and method of research which it has in mind, and chooses for that purpose an account of the Roman citizens either of rank or note who lived in the times between Augustus and Diocletian. The idea of men of note is understood liberally as regards Romans; Greeks and barbarians are not admitted without real cause. The names are arranged alphabetically, on the usual principles; and the several articles show (with the utmost brevity of course) what is known of each man, or at least where what is known may be found. The accounts set out by saying who each person was, and then the text of the inscriptions relating to him or her is often transcribed in full, the literary sources merely indicated. Here is a fairly typical article:—

'Sex. Lucilius Bassus (*praenomen dederunt diplomata militaria, cf. infra*). *Plane incertum, num ex stirpe Lucilii Bassi quem memorat Cicero ad Att.* 12. 5. 2.—Praefectus alae, *Tac. h.* 2. 100. A Vitellio Ravennati simul et Misenensi classibus praepositus, *ib.* Iratus quod non statim praefectus praetorio factus sit, classem Ravennatem Flavianis prodidit *Tac. h.* 2. 100, 101, 3. 12, *cf. c.* 36, 40. In vincula conicitur, sed mox solvitur, *Tac.* 3. 12. Interfecto Vitellio mittitur ad componendam Campaniam, *Tac. h.* 4. 3. Praefectus utriusque classis etiamtum ineunte a. 71 *diplomata militaria data d.* 5 *Apr.* 71 (*III. p.* 860, *III. S. p.* 1959 = *X* 867).—Legatus missus in Iudaeam *Iosephus bell.* 7. 6. 1 (*adlectus scilicet inter praetorios a Vespasiano; nisi mavis statuere duos eo tempore fuisse Lucilios Bassos*), exercitum a Sex. Vettuleno Ceriale accipit, Herodium et Machaeruntem castella capit, item saltum dictum Iarden, *Iosephus bell.* 7. 6. 1—5. Terram Iudaeam vendere jubetur a Vespasiano, *ib.* 6. Mox obit, *ib.* 7. 8. 1.

The first volume (A—C) is the work of E. Klebs: the second (D—O) of H. Dessau; the third, not yet published, was assigned to P. v. Rohden, upon whose illness Dessau undertook to finish it; the fourth will contain the *fasti consulares* and lists of all citizens who held public office. Under the general rules laid down by the Academy the writings of literary men are not dwelled on, and the private life rather than the public actions of the emperors makes the bulk of their articles; literary and political history may be better studied elsewhere. The editor of the second volume acknowledges special obligations to Th. Mommsen and O. Hirschfeld for revision of proofs, and to F. Imhoof-Blumer and B. Pick for help in the department of numismatics. Only a long familiarity with the book, perhaps one of years, could enable a reader—or rather user—of it to say how far its authors have succeeded in carrying out the excellent scheme of its projectors; but our first impressions are very favourable. Where we have tested it, the result is satisfactory. The printing too is careful. We have noticed nothing amiss here except that the articles *Fronto* and *Frugi* are run together. To many students, and on many lines of investigation, these handsome volumes will be of great use. Visitors to Rome will remember that among the few inscriptions still visible there in public places is one in honour of Q. Herennius Etruscus (Via di Campo Carleo, close by the Forum of Trajan), and that they have not found it easy to ascertain who this Herennius was. Of course the information could be had, but not everywhere or readily; but now the *Prosopographia* offers it in an accessible form, and no doubt it will presently find its way to writers of guidebooks. (But we must not expect learned sources to be used too quickly; an old established and widely used Handbook of Rome still talks of the *Corpus Prescriptionum Latinarum.*) The *Prosopographia* costs, vol. I. 24 marks, vol. II. 20 marks.

F. T. Richards.

CARUSELLI ON THE ORIGIN OF THE ITALIANS.

Sulle Origini dei popoli Italici, by Giovanni Caruselli, Palermo, 1896.

This learned book belongs to a class which did much to fill the shelves of antiquarians a century ago—those written to maintain some one ethnological conjecture which was to solve forthwith all the riddles in all the early history of all the peoples of the globe. The author's enthusiasm for his subject and his first-hand acquaintance with a wide range of ancient authorities entitle him to respect; but they will hardly win him converts among students who have been trained in stricter methods of inference or research. Signor Caruselli's main object seems to be to unite Ligurians, Sicilians, Oscans, Etruscans, Peloponnesians, Pelasgians, Philistines and a large number of other ancient races under the name Hamitic, and incidentally to show that Sicily was the first home of European civilisation. A great part of his argument is unhappily based on 'etymologies'; and its only result is to show the fatal effects of such speculation, always dangerous, but doubly so when unrestrained by any conception of phonetic law. The Phoenicians are 'only Phaeacians' (p. 6), the different 'spelling' being due 'to the natural changes which words undergo' in passing from one language or dialect into another. Equally 'easy to understand' is the 'change' (p. 12) from Ibĕrĭa to Hypĕreia: and of (p. 174) the (Italian!) phrase 'io pago il reo' into the name of the Ἄρειος πάγος. Again (p. 132) '*Pela-s-gi* were really *Fili-stei*' (the Philistines), because '*pela* and *fili* are synonyms used indifferently in Italian.' 'The land of the *Pelo* was of necessity ("doveva") called the land of the Pelo, and this phrase could not but become Πελας γη in the language of the Graeco-Aryans.' The reader is at first inclined to hope that these etymologies are only meant as a kind of fanciful by-play, but unhappily the author enunciates (p. 46) five principles of enquiry, including some dealing with etymological arguments, in a form which is entirely uncritical.

Yet, when all is said, the book renders one substantial and most timely service to scholarship, by directing attention to the abundant material for research left to us in ancient writers; a source of knowledge which in our modern diggings and derivings it has become the fashion to neglect. And in at least one particular, his sharp distinction between Hellenes and Pelasgians, Sign. Caruselli's fidelity to the ancients brings him happily into line with the most recent advances[1] of archaeological research in this country.

R. S. Conway.

Cardiff, *October*, 1897.

[1] Ridgeway, *Journ. Hellen. Stud.* xvi. 77.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

PLINY'S CHAPTERS ON ART.

The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art. R. Jex-Blake and E. Sellers. London, Macmillan & Co. 14*s*.

This is a work which must earn for these two alumnars of Girton the gratitude of all students of Greek art. The main bulk of the book is made up of the text of those chapters of Pliny which bear on Greek art, together with a running translation and full archaeological commentary. To this is prefixed an introduction of ninety-four pages dealing with the sources of Pliny's information; at the end are added an appendix comprising a few isolated passages from the *Naturalis Historia*, which bear on the history of art together with a parallel passage from Athenagoras, ten pages of addenda containing extra notes, and two indices, of the artists mentioned in the book and of the localities of various statues in the days of Pliny. Miss Jex-Blake is responsible for the translation, and Miss Sellers for the commentary and introduction, while some additional suggestions are offered by Dr. H. L. Urlichs.

The text adopted and the translation do not seem to us to call for much criticism. The text differs little from that of Detlefsen, and, where this is the case, generally adheres more closely to that of the Codex Bambergensis; too closely perhaps in certain places, for instance in xxxvi. 25 where *campteras* is adopted instead of Jan's emendation *lampteras*. The meaning attributed to the word is that of 'columns,' such as marked the turning points in the stadium: but it does not seem to be used exactly in this sense by

either Greek or Roman writers, unless indeed ἐπὶ τοῖς καμπτῆρσιν (Ar. *Rhet.* iii. 9, 2) be taken to mean 'opposite the columns' rather than 'after the turn.' Certainly the usual meaning of the term is 'the turning part of the course'; cf. Pacuv. ap. Non. i. 238: Extremum intra campterem ipsum praegradat Parthenorem. To Miss Sellers we are indebted for one distinctly brilliant emendation; the reading *'Alcman poeta'* in xxxiv. 71 differing but little from that of the MSS., giving much better sense than *Alcmena* after the words *'hominum effigie,'* and according well with the mention in the *Anthology* of statues of the poet. The translation of Miss Jex-Blake deserves untold praise; it is always clear and, if tending towards freedom rather than scholarly accuracy,[1] is eminently readable; and that in the case of an author of the character of Pliny is no small achievement. The most important suggestion made in the notes, or rather in the addenda, is that the sculptor of the Hermes of Olympia was not Praxiteles but his father Cephisodotus the elder, who is credited by Pliny with such a group. The question seems to us to be one of intricate artistic criticism, and we doubt the wisdom of opening a discussion of such complexity in a short note of some thirty lines.

Great, however, as are the merits of the book as a reading edition of those chapters of Pliny which bear on art, it is in the Introduction that we find matter of the greatest interest. The study of the sources of Pliny's information, though no new one in Germany, has never been seriously taken up by English scholars, so that students of the subject have had to have recourse to numerous scattered German monographs, some of them difficult to obtain. We are doubly indebted therefore to Miss Sellers for collecting with admirable patience and completeness the results arrived at by these scholars, and for putting them before us in a clear and concise form; even if she had added no fresh conjectures of her own, her introduction would have been most valuable from this point of view, and, though we may not be as firm believers as Miss Sellers is herself in these German methods and the deductions derived from them, it is essential that any archaeologist should know and be able to judge of the fruits of the most methodical analysis which any writer has perhaps ever undergone.

Personally we must confess ourselves not a little sceptical as to many of the conclusions arrived at and as to the validity of the methods adopted. Though of course in such a study we cannot look for absolute certainty of results, yet, if in one or two instances we note in tabulated form the facts known about certain of the authors quoted by Pliny, and the attributions made to them by Miss Sellers and her German prototypes, it will perhaps be apparent on how thin a thread of fact some of these conjectures hang.

It is to Xenocrates (of Sicyon?) that with great probability the main framework of Pliny's *History of Art* is attributed. Of him we know the following facts: (*a*) He was an artist and pupil of either Tisicrates or Euthycrates of Sicyon, flourishing probably about 280 B.C. (Plin. xxxiv. 83, Diog. Laert. iv. 15). Miss Sellers without any due reason differentiates him from the Xenocrates, son of Ergophilus of Athens. (*b*) He wrote *'De Toreutice'* (Pliny, *l.c.* and Ind. to Lib. xxxiv.). (*c*) He also wrote about painting, and is quoted by Pliny (xxxv. 68) as offering a distinctly artistic criticism of the work of Parrhasius. (*d*) His date corresponds roughly with that to which Pliny assigns the fall of ancient art. On these four facts hang all the following attributions to Xenocrates of passages in Pliny. (*a*) The five or six well-known criticisms of the greater Greek sculptors, as being the criticisms of an artist, as showing a partiality for the school of Sicyon, and as occupying in the history of sculpture a position parallel to the series of criticisms of the great painters, one of which is distinctly attributed to Xenocrates by Pliny. (*b*) Because Xenocrates was the author of the criticism of Parrhasius, he is reasonably concluded to be the source of the whole series of criticisms of the greater painters, to which this belongs. (*c*) To him is also attributed the main body of the alphabetical and chronological tables of sculptors, 'simple directness' being 'a clear mark of Xenocratic authorship.' (*d*) To Xenocrates as being a native of Sicyon, which is distinctly questionable, and a pupil of the Sicyonian school of art, are also attributed all passages putting forward the claim of this school to greatness; the attribution of the invention of sculpture to Dipoenus and Skyllis, and the whole early history of art (though he is also credited with the statement that sculpture began with Pheidias); the whole history of the

[1] We have noticed a few instances in which the translation seems at least questionable, if not absolutely wrong; *e.g.* 33, 156, *in emblemate* is apparently translated 'on the interior'; 34, 66, *constantiam* surely means 'firmness' rather than 'perseverance'; 35, 126, *cam picturam* translated 'technical innovation' should rather be 'that design.' 35, 153, to refer *Idem* back to Butades, though it may be necessary, at least requires some defence.

early development of painting (though he dates the beginning of this art also from the same artist);[1] and the whole history of clay-modelling from Butades to Lysistratus.

Now whatever may be our views as to the probability of the Xenocratic authorship of these passages, to say with Miss Sellers that they can be 'traced back with certainty' to that author seems to us to be going beyond the mark, and we should not be inclined to base on this degree of probability numerous other conjectures as to Xenocrates himself and other artists—conjectures which in one case force us to change our view as to the nationality of an artist, and in another force us to suppose that within a single century there were at Sicyon two painters of the name of Nealces. Into this latter case we propose to enter in some detail as providing a further instance of the methods of this new inquiry.

The most important place, after Xenocrates, among the authors from whom Pliny drew his information, is given to Duris. To recount all we know of him and his writings would here be beside the mark, nor do we wish in detail to go through all the Plinian passages attributed to him. But for the case in point the following facts may be mentioned: he was a tyrant of Samos born 340 B.C., and he died c. 270 B.C. Among other writings attributed to him are *Lives of Sculptors and Poets* and a work *De Toreutice*. He was a Peripatetic and appears to have been 'a curious inquirer into personal anecdote,' but a by no means trustworthy historian. He is quoted by Pliny as recording that Lysippus was originally a poor coppersmith, and had no regular training, following the well-known advice of Eupompus to make nature his master. He was, further, Plutarch's authority for the rise of Eumenes from poverty, while according to Diogenes Laertius he made Socrates originally a slave. Now on the ground of these facts we find attributed to him *all* instances of untrained artists rising to greatness, *all* stories of the meeting of great artists, and *all* mention of men, originally poor, acquiring great wealth. Among these one of the better known is the case of Erigonus, originally the slave and colour-mixer of Nealces, who rose to eminence and later had a school of his own. But the only date in the life of Nealces of which we have record is 251 B.C., some twenty years after the death of Duris, when he was with Aratus at the freeing of Sicyon. For this reason, and on the ground of Münzer's extremely ingenious interpretation of a picture attributed to Nealces, the great artist and the artist-friend of Aratus are declared to be different people, and the apparent contradiction of dates is explained away. The method of argument is simple, but we doubt much whether it be sound.

We have spoken of these two cases of Xenocrates and Duris, not at all because the conclusions arrived at with regard to these writers seem to us more far-fetched than in the cases of the other authorities quoted by Pliny, but because they seem to present a fair sample of the whole. With many of the attributions of parts of Pliny to various earlier authors we heartily agree; the introduction to this volume brims over with ingenious and suggestive points of criticism; nor is it the fault of Miss Sellers if we cannot wholly pin our faith to the reasoning of her German masters. She has played her part in handing on to us the fruits of their labours, adding many an acute suggestion of her own.

There is one point about the volume however, which, much against our will, we are bound to mention, namely the evident need of greater care both in the revision of the proofs and in the method of writing. This failing is constantly betraying itself, more especially in the introduction, in false references to the text, in distinctly questionable forms of ancient names, *e.g.* Ailianos and John Lydos, and in inaccurate writing, *e.g.* 'a distinct person to' (= distinct from, p. xlii), 'at a moment that' (= at a moment when, p. xlvi), and many other similar slips. These points would not have called for notice, but that it is a thousand pities that they should mar a book which must deservedly become a standard work of reference for all archaeological students.

A. G. Bather.

[1] In dealing with the story of the clipeus at Athens painted by Pheidias, Miss Sellers seems to raise unnecessary difficulties. Two explanations are equally possible: (*a*) the clipeus was that of Athene Parthenos, which he designed before, and probably painted, after it was carved: cf. the story of Parrhasius and Mys, and the epigram quoted Ath. xi. p. 782 B, γράμμα Παῤῥασίοιο τέχνα Μυός κ.τ.λ.; or (*b*) the clipeus was a round tablet for a picture, cf. Facc. Forc. *s.v.*

MONTHLY RECORD.

GREECE.

Athens.—In front of the grotto of Apollo (see above, p. 415) was found a quadrangular sinking in the rock, intended to receive the lowest layer of the altar, which was built of irregular stones. It has been conjectured that the numerous votive-inscriptions of the thesmothetae which have fallen out of the grotto into the building below (see above, p. 415), are to be connected with the oath taken by the archons on entering upon office (Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 7, 1).

—A small open grotto in the rock immediately above the Klepsydra was formerly attributed to Apollo by Göttling on the evidence of the letters ΠΟΛ which he read in a niche. In the recent investigations neither the inscription nor the niche has been found; and the supposed letters were probably merely natural markings.[1]

Mycenae.—The section of the Acropolis behind the polygonal tower on the west side has been laid bare. The rubbish in this part lay as deep as 10 metres at least. The ruins of several houses were discovered, and amongst them a female head of limestone, measuring 0·17 m. in height. Hair, eyes, ears, and mouth are painted; the neck is adorned with a necklace of alternately blue and red beads. The most curious point is that the face is decorated with four rosettes, one on the brow, one on the chin, and one on each cheek. Tsuntas takes this to be an indication of tattooing. Besides this head there were found an archaic bronze inscription and a gem representing an animal-headed demon subduing two lions. — Outside the acropolis a number of graves have been opened, the amount of treasure in which varies with their distance from the Acropolis. Only one bee-hive tomb (Kuppel-grab) was discovered, but this one is carried out in very good style. The vault measures about 8 m. in diameter at the ground-level, and is built of hard hewn stones; the façade is of hewn poros stones; and the interstices between the layers are often filled up with lime. In the floor of this tomb were found three oblong graves, the longest being of 4 m., all covered with large slabs. They had been plundered in antiquity; but the robbers had left outside them, on the floor of the building, several objects: some little plates of glass paste with figures in relief of animal-headed demons standing beside a tripod or altar and holding vessels in their hands. Such figures have not hitherto been found on this kind of glass-ware, and Tsuntas concludes that it was made at Mycenae.[2]

ASIA MINOR.

Mr. J. G. C. Anderson's researches in Asia Minor during the present year have resulted in settling many topographical problems. He has discovered the ruins of Trapezopolis, the existence of which was already conjectured in the Lycos valley, on a plateau 1½ hours S.E. of the railway station at Serai Keui. The modern name is Bolo. The river Kapros is probably, as Ramsay has lately conjectured, the Geuk Bunar Su, a tributary of the Lycos, and formerly wrongly identified with the Kadmos. Kidramos is placed beside Budjak Keui on the slopes of the Tchibuk Dagh, and Sanaos, by epigraphic evidence, at Sarikavak. On the line of the eastern trade-route, the following sites are more or less certain: Chelidonia—Diniae at Karadilli, Kinnaborion at Armudli, Holmoi at Karadjören, Hadrianopolis (= Thymbrion) in the plain at or near Kotchash. In Phrygia Paroreios there are two newly found towns at the foot of Sultan Dagh, Selinda (Selind) and Pisa (Bissa). In the Praipenisseis country, between the villages Doghan-Arslan and Gerriz, has been found the site of ἡ Μειονῶν πόλις, *i.e.* Meros. In the neighbourhood is a rock-monument of considerable interest. The site of Bria is now fixed one and three quarter miles N.W. of Burgas, at which place both Radet and Ramsay had independently proposed to place it. Besides these topographical facts, Mr. Anderson has discovered a number of interesting inscriptions.[3]

Journal of Hellenic Studies. Vol. xvii. Part i. 1. Cecil Smith: Inscriptions from Melos. 2. J. G. C. Anderson: The Road-System of Eastern Asia Minor, with the Evidence of Byzantine Campaigns (Map); Excursus on the Royal Road. 3. T. W. Allen: The Text of the Homeric Hymns (Part iii.). 4. H. B. Walters: On some Antiquities of the Mycenaean Age recently acquired by the British Museum (Plate). 5. G. F. Hill: Notes on additions to the Greek Coins in the British Museum, 1887–1896 (Plate). 6. J. B. Bury: The Nika Riot. 7. P. Gardner: The Mantinean Basis; a Note. 8. D. Mackenzie: Excavations of the British School at Melos; the Site of the 'Three Churches' (Plan). 9. J. L. Myres: Excavations in Cyprus in 1894. 10. C. E. Edgar: Two Stelae from Kynosarges (Plate). 11. W. Rhys Roberts: The Greek Treatise on the Sublime; its Modern Interest.

G. F. Hill.

[1] *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 30 Oct.
[2] *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 16 Oct.
[3] *Athen.* 23 Oct.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

The Journal of Philology. Vol. xxv. No. 50. 1897.

On the Salinon *of Archimedes*, T. L. Heath. Maintains that the name of this figure is simply a Graecised form of the Lat. *salinum*, 'salt-cellar.' *Early Citations from the Book of Enoch*, H. J. Lawlor. A contribution towards a complete list of the references to this book in early patristic writers, and an estimate of the authority attributed to it by those writers. *Notes on the Homeric Hymns by J. P. D'Orville*, T. W. Allen. These notes are worth publishing, being written at a time when no MSS. had been collated since the Ed. pr. in 1488. *Notes on Bücheler's Carmina Epigraphica*, Robinson Ellis. *Silvae Manilianae Appendix*, J. P. Postgate. *Trasimene*, G. B. Grundy. Maintains the Tuoro site of the battlefield in opposition to Mr. Henderson [Cl. Rev. sup. p. 227]. *On Passages in Plato's Philebus*, H. Jackson. *Emendationes Homericae*, T. L. Agar. On books xix.–xxiv.

The American Journal of Philology. Vol. xviii. 1. Whole No. 69. April, 1897.

Dörpfeld and the Greek Theatre, T. D. Goodell. Considers the universal acceptance of D.'s view to be merely a question of time. *The Question of Language-standard in Modern Greece*, B. I. Wheeler. Etiam, *in Plautus and Terence*, W. H. Kirk. Distinguishes three distinct values of *etiam*, viz. temporal ('still'), additory ('also') and intensive ('even'). It is originally a temporal particle. *The Origin of Latin* haud *and Greek* οὐ; *and the Extensions of the Originally Uncxtended Form*, L. Horton-Smith. Refers both to the Idg. ground form **ōu* from the Idg. √*eu* 'to fail.'

Notes. Latin *-astro*, G. M. Bolling. *On the Alleged Confusion of Nymph-Names.* Appendix, J. P. Postgate. [Cl. Rev. x. 330]. *νέμειν and νέμεσθαι*, W. H. Kirk. Among the *books reviewed* are Peck's Harper's *Dictionary of Classical Literature and Antiquities*, Puntoni's *L'Inno Omerico a Demetra*,

Ciccotti's *Il Processo di Verre*, and Bornecque's *M. Tullii Ciceronis in Verrem*, De Signis. There are *Brief Mentions* of Page, Palmer and Wilkins' *Horace*, and the 4th Ed. of Classen's *Thucydides*, Book I. by Steup.

Part 2. Whole No. 70. July, 1897. *The Subjunctive in Independent Sentences in Plautus*, E. P. Morris. This paper is limited to a presentation of the facts of usage: others will follow. *Textual Notes and Queries on Plautus.* This article is on the *Mostellaria*. *Superstitions and Popular Beliefs in Greek Comedy*, E. Riess. A companion paper to the same writers 'Superstition in Greek Tragedy.' *On the Definition of Some Rhetorical Terms*, V. J. Emery. A paper on certain words and definitions either omitted or incorrectly given in some dictionaries named. If the writer had also consulted Ernesti's *Lexicon technologiae Latinorum rhetoricae* he would not have had so much to write.

Among the *books reviewed* are Schanz's *Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der gricchischen Sprache*, Band iii. Heft 3 u. 4 and Dyroff's *Geschichte des Pronomen Reflexivum*. There are *Brief Mentions* of Zielinski's *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte*, Weil's *Études sur le drame antique*, Marchant's *Thucydides* Book vi., Rutherford's *Scholia Aristophanica*, and Sandys' *First Philippic and the Olynthiacs of Demosthenes.*

Mnemosyne. N.S. Vol. xxv. Part 3. 1897.

Lysiaca, H. van Herwerden. Critical notes. *De Horatii carminibus ad rempublicam et Caesarem pertinentibus*, H. T. Karsten. Three divisions are made, (1) B.C. 42–31. (2) B.C. 28–24 panegyric and ethical odes. (3) The odes of Book iv. The first two divisions are here dealt with, and there is a short digression on the names *Caesar* and *Augustus* in Horace, Vergil, and Propertius. *Homerica*, J. van Leeuwen. Continued from last no. [Cl. Rev. sup. p. 369]. This paper is on the fragments recently edited by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt. *Observatiunculae de jure Romano*, J. C. Naber. Continued [Cl. Rev. sup. p. 369]. This paper is *De pignore praetorio.* *De loco quodam Vergilii*, P. H. Damsté. In Aen. vi. would insert 607 between 585 and 586. *Studia Lucretiana*, J. Woltjer. Continued from the last vol. [Cl. Rev. x. 361]. Notes on ii. 1020, 1139–1140, 1146–1149, 1170–1172, iii. 26–27, 189–195, 298, and 336–349. *Ad Thucyd.* vi. 37, 2, E. C. Marchant. Against J. van Leeuwen, and defends his own conj. οἰκίσαντες. [Cl. Rev. sup. p. 368]. *Ad Martialem*, J. J. Hartman. Critical notes. *Ad Thucyd.* iii. 45, 3, J. v. L. Reads τῶν πλείστων ἀδικημάτων for τ. μεγίστων ἀ.

Part 4. *De Monumento Ancyrano sententiae controversae*, J. W. Beck. Dissents from some of Wölfflin's views 'de hac inscriptionum regina.' *De templis Romanis*, I. M. J. Valeton. Continued [Cl. Rev. sup. p. 369]. This paper is 'De prolationibus pomerii.' *De codice Laurentiano* lxviii. 2. *Apulei Metamorphoscon*, J. van der Vliet. The results of a further collation of this MS. with reference to the writer's edition of the Metamorphoses of Apuleius.

Deus conversus in pretium, J. C. Vollgraff. On Eur. Andr. 160 *sqq.* In 169 proposes οὐ Πρίαμος οὐδὲ Φοῖβος ἀλλ' Ἑλλὰς πόλις. *Ad Iliadis xii. libros posteriores commentatio altera*, H. van Herwerden. A review of Leeuwen and Mendes da Costa's ed. continued [Cl. Rev. sup. p. 368]. ΙΗΣΟΥ ΛΟΓΙΟΝ, S. A. N. In ἐὰν μὴ νηστεύσητε τὸν κόσμον, οὐ μὴ εὕρητε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, the ingenious conjecture is made ἐὰν μνηστεύσητε κ.τ.λ. ΚΝΙΞΜΑΓΑ, S. A. Naber. Various emendations on the minor works of Xenophon. *Inscriptio emendata*, H. v. H. An inscr. from Apamea publ. in *Mittheilungen des K. D. Archaeologischen Instituts*, 1896 p. 374. *Ad Herodam*, J. v. L. In Herodas i. 41 proposes [Μάνδριν] πρὸς ἄλλον and in *ib.* 64 ἡδέω[ς τε κεῖσει καὶ]. *Ad Thucyd.* iii. 59, 2, J. v. L. Inserts τε after προφερόμενοι and δὲ after ἰκέται. *Ad Platon*, J. v. L. In Rep. 586 B proposes σκληροῖς for σιδηροῖς.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN BOOKS.

Archimedes. Works, edited in modern notation, with introductory chapters by T. L. Heath. 8vo. 514 pp. Cambridge University Press. 15*s.*

Bunting (S. P.) Res nautica apud antiquos. (Chancellor's Latin Essay.) 8vo. 20 pp. Oxford, Blackwell. 1*s.* 6*d.*

Caesar (Julius). The Second Book of the Gallic War, edited by W. C. Collar. 16mo. 9, 96 pp. Boston. Ginn. 40 cts.

Ciccro. De amicitia (on friendship) from the Latin, by B. E. Smith. Thumb-nail series. 24mo. 3, 173 pp. New York, Century Co. $1.

—— Life and Letters. Life by Dr. Middleton; Letters to his Friends, translated by Wm. Melmoth; Letters to Atticus, translated by Dr. Heberden. Royal 8vo. 849 pp., portrait. Nimmo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Conway (R. S.) The Italic Dialects, edited with a grammar and glossary. 2 vols. Royal 8vo. xxviii, 686 pp. Cambridge, University Press. £1 10*s.*

Demosthenes. The Olynthiac Speeches, edited with introduction and notes by J. R. Glover. 12mo. 152 pp. Pitt Press Series. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Green (G. B.) Notes on Greek and Latin Syntax. Crown 8vo. 212 pp. Methuen. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Hentley (H. R.) Pantoia, a second book of Greek translation. 12mo. 104 pp. Longmans. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Heppin (J. M.) Greek Art on Greek Soil. 8vo. 264 pp. Bliss. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Herodotus. Ionic Revolt and Persian War: the Story as told by Herodot. Selections from the translation of Canon Rawlinson, revised by C. C. Tancock. Crown 8vo. 248 pp., engravings. Murray. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Higley (E. H.) Exercises in Greek, based on Xenophon's Anabasis and Hellenica, with notes and vocabulary. 12mo. 17, 170 pp. Boston, Ginn. $1.10.

Homer. Eight books of Homer's Odyssey, with introduction, commentary, and vocabulary by B. Perrin and T. D. Seymour. 12 mo. 68, 107 pp. Boston, Ginn. $1.50.

—— Snider (D. J.) Homer's Odyssey. (An exposition and commentary.) 8vo. 534 pp. St. Louis, Mo. $2.

Jannaris (A. N.) Historical Greek grammar, chiefly of the Attic dialect, as written and spoken from classical antiquity to the present time. Founded

upon the ancient texts, inscriptions, papyri, and present popular Greek. 8vo. 776 pp. Macmillan. 25*s.*

Johnson (C. W. L.) Musical pitch and the measurements of intervals among the ancient Greeks. 8vo. 71 pp. Baltimore.

Lanciani (R.) The Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome. Crown 8vo. 654 pp. Boston, Houghton, M. & Co. $4.

Liddell (H. G.) and R. Scott. A Greek-English Lexicon. 8th ed. revised. 4to. 1794 pp. Frowde. £1 16*s.*

Lyttelton (E.) Are we to go on with Latin Verses? Crown 8vo. 202 pp. Longmans. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Masom (W. F.) and F. L. D. Richardson. A Key to the Exercises and Test Questions on the Tutorial Latin Grammar. Crown 8vo. 94 pp. Clive. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Meader (C. L.) List of books recommended for a high-school classical library by a committee of the Michigan Schoolmasters' Club, with an introductory note by F. W. Kelsey. 2nd ed. revised. 8vo. 32 pp. New York. 10 cts.

Middle Form Greek Reading Books. Pylos and Sphacteria from Thucydides, Book 4. Edited by W. H. D. Rouse, 12mo. Rivingtons. 1*s.* 6*d.*

Middleton (G.) Latin Verse Unseens. Crown 8vo. Blackwood. 1*s.* 6*d.*

Nall (G. H.) Elementary Latin-English dictionary to prose of Caesar, Sallust, Nepos, Livy, Eutropius, etc, ; to poems of Catullus, Vergil, Horace, Ovid, Phaedrus, etc. Crown 8vo. 440 pp. Macmillan 3*s.* 6*d.*

Nicholson (W. F.) Theocritean Hexameters. (Gaisford Prize.) Crown 8vo. 16 pp. Oxford, Blackwell. 1*s.*

Pearson (H. Carr.) Greek Prose Composition. 12mo. 187 pp. New York. 90 cts.

Plato. The Philebus, edited by R. G. Bury. 8vo. Cambridge University Press. 12*s.* 6*d.*

—— The Republic, edited by James Adam. Crown 8vo. Cambridge University Press. 4*s.* 6*d.*

Richardson (F. L. D.) and A. E. W. Hazel. Exercises and Test Questions on the Tutorial Latin Grammar. Crown 8vo. 152 pp. Clive. 1*s.* 6*d.*

Seneca. Beauchamp (Virginia). The Creed of Lucius Annaeus Seneca. 12mo. 39 pp. Syracuse. 25 cts.

Sophocles. The Text of the Seven Plays, edited by R. C. Jebb. Crown 8vo. Cambridge University Press. 5*s.*

—— Electra, edited with introduction and English notes by L. Campbell and E. Abbott. Fcp. 8vo. Frowde. 2*s.*

Walters (W. C. F.) First Steps in Continuous Latin Prose. Crown 8vo. 112 pp. Blackie. 2*s.*

—— Hints and Helps in Continuous Greek Prose. Crown 8vo. 144 pp. Blackie. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Ward (A. S.) Empedocles. Chancellor's Latin Verse. 8vo. 16 pp. Oxford, Blackwell. 1*s.*

Xenophon. Anabasis, Book 3, edited with introduction, notes, and vocabulary, by G. M. Edwards. 12mo. 134 pp. Pitt Press Series. 1*s.* 6*d.*

FOREIGN BOOKS.

Aeschylus. Schwarz (P.) De Ephymniorum apud Aeschylum usu. 8vo. 56 pp. Halle.

Ἀριστοφάνους Εἰρήνη. Cum scholiorum antiquorum excerptis passim emendatis recogn. et adnot. H. van Herwerden. 2 parts. 8vo. xxxix, 112, 244 pp. Leiden, Sijthoff. 12 Mk. 50.

Aristoteles. Bursy (Bernh.) De Aristotelis Πολιτείας Ἀθηναίων partis alterius autoritate et fonte. 8vo. viii, 148 pp. Jurjew. 2 Mk. 50 Pf.

Babrii Fabulae Aesopeae, recogn., prolegomenis et indicibus instr. O. Crusius. Acced. fabularum dactylicarum et iambicarum reliquiae. Ignatii et aliorum tetrasticha iambica recensita a C. F. Müller. 8vo. clvi, 440 pp. 3 plates. Leipzig, Teubner. 8 Mk. 40.

Bolland (G. J. P. J.) Die althellenische Wortbetonung im Lichte der Geschichte. 8vo. 101 pp. Leiden. 2 Mk. 50.

Caesaris (C. Julii.) Bellum gallicum. Für den Schulgebrauch ausgewählt und bearbeitet von W. Haellingk. Vol. I. Text. 8vo. 32, 205 pp. Map and plate. Münster, Aschendorff. 1 Mk. 50.

—— Stolle (F.) Wo schlug Cäsar die Usipeter und Teukterer? Wo überbrückte er den Rhein? 4to. 15 pp. Schlettstadt.

Catonis (M. Porci.) De agricultura liber, M. Terenti Varronis rerum rusticarum libri III. ex rec. H. Keilii. Vol. III., Fasc. 1. Index verborum in Catonis de re rustica librum, comp. R. Krumbiegel. 8vo. iii, 82 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk.

Columellae (L. Juni Moderati.) Opera quae extant, rec. Vilh. Lundström. Fasc. I. Liber de arboribus. 8vo. xii, 43 pp. Upsaliae. 1 Mk. 50.

—— Becher (W.) De Lucii Junii Moderati Columellae vita et scriptis. 8vo. 84 pp. Leipzig, Gräfe. 2 Mk.

Comici. Jungius (C. L.) De vocabulis antiquae comoediae, quae apud solos comicos aut omnino inveniuntur aut peculiari notione praedita occurrunt. 8vo. xxiv, 358, 6 pp. Trajecti, Müller. 10 Mk.

Demosthenes. Reden für den Schulgebrauch ausgewählt und bearbeitet von Chrn. Harder. Part I. Text. Nebst Abschnitten aus den Reden anderer Attiker. 8vo. xxxi, 160 pp. Münster, Aschendorff. 1 Mk. 25.

Firmici Materni (Julii) matheseos libri VIII. ediderunt W. Kroll et F. Skutsch. Fasc. I. Libros IV. priores et quinti prooemium continens. 8vo. xii, 280 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 4 Mk.

Fuchs (Jos.) Hannibal's Alpenübergang. Ein Studien- und Reiseergebniss. 8vo. 153 pp. 2 maps, 1 plate. Vienna, Konegen. 3 Mk. 40.

Grabreliefs (Die attischen.) Herausgegeben im Auftrag der kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien, von Alex. Conze. Part IX. Royal folio. Pp. 219-242. 25 plates, engravings. Berlin, Spemann. 60 Mk.

Haeberlin (C.) Griechische Papyri. Aus "Centralblatt für Bibliothekwesen." 8vo. 131 pp. Leipzig, Harrassowitz. 3 Mk. 60.

Haym (Conr.) De puerorum in re scaenica Graecorum partibus. 8vo. 78 pp. (Dissert. Halenses xiii; 3.) Halle, Niemeyer. 2 Mk.

Heberdey (Rud.) Opramoas. Inschriften vom Heroon zu Rhodiapolis. Im Auftrag der kleinasiatischen Commission der kais. Akademie der Wiss. neu bearbeitet. 8vo. 71 pp. 5 plates. Wien, Hölder. 5 Mk.

Herzog (E.) Zur Verwaltungsgeschichte des attischen Staats. 4to. 58 pp. Tübingen.

Hildenbrand (F. J.) Signaleulum medici ocularii Romani in agro Frankenthalensi repertum et primum in quaestionem vocatum. 8vo. 4 pp. 1 plate. Frankenthal.

Hölder (O.) Die Formen der römischen Thongefässe diesseits und jenseits der Alpen. 4to. vii, 38 pp. 24 plates. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer. 3 Mk.

Homer. Adam (L.) Homer, der Erzieher der Griechen. 8vo. viii, 148 pp. Paderborn, Schöning. 3 Mk.

Homerus. Autenrieth (Geo.) Wörterbuch zu den homerischen Gedichten. 8th edition. 8vo. xvi, 382 pp., 166 engravings, 2 maps. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk.

Horatius. Rosenthal (G.) De sententiis Horatianis. 8vo. 51 pp. Berlin.

Imhoof-Blumer (F.) Lydische Stadtmünzen. Neue Untersuchungen. Mit 6 Registern. (Aus 'Revue Suisse de Numismatique.') 8vo. iii, 213 pp., 151 engravings. Genf. 10 Mk.

Kochm (Jos.) Quaestiones Plautinae Terentianaeque. 8vo. 56 pp. Giessen, Ricker. 1 Mk. 20.

Limes (Der obergermanisch-raetische) des Römerreiches herausgegeben von O. von Sarwey und F. Hettner. Part vi. 4to. 4, 13, 9 pp., 9 plates, 1 map, engravings. Heidelberg, Petters. 3 Mk. 60.

Lindsay (W. M.) Die lateinische Sprache. Ihre Laute, Stamme und Flexionen in sprachgeschichtlicher Darstellung, übersetzt von Hans Nohl. 8vo. xvi, 747 pp. Leipzig, Hirzel. 14 Mk.

Livius (Des Titus) römische Geschichte, in Auszug herausgegeben von F. Fügner. Vol. 1. Der 2 punische Krieg. Text. 8vo. iv, 294 pp., 1 plan and 2 maps. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk.

Lucian. Stach (Carol.) De Philopatride dialogo Pseudo-Luciani dissertatio philologica. 8vo. 20 pp. Krakau. 60 Pf.

Lucretius. Paulson (Jo.) Lucrezstudien. I. Die äussere Form des lucrezischen Hexameters. 8vo. 37 pp. Gothenburg, Wettergren. 1 Mk. 10.

Lydi (Jo. Laurentii) liber de ostentis et calendaria graeca omnia, iterum ed. Curt Wachsmuth. Acced. epimetra duo de cometis et de terrae motibus. 12mo. lxxii, 366 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 6 Mk.

Menander. Le laboureur de Menandre. Fragments inédits sur papyrus d'Egypte dedriffrés, traduits et commentés par Jules Nicole. 8vo. 77 pp. Basle, Georg. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Minucius Felix. Norden (E.) De Minucii Felicis aetate et genere dicendi. 8vo. 62 pp. Greifswald.

Moore (Clifford H.) Julius Firmicus Maternus, der Heide und der Christ. 8vo. 54 pp. München. 1 Mk. 20.

Mythographi graeci. Vol. III. Fasc. 1. Pseudo-Eratosthenis Catasterismi rec. A. Olivieri. 8vo. xviii, 76 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 20.

Niedermann (M.) Ē und Ī im Lateinischen. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Lateinischen Vocalismus. 8vo. 126 pp. Basel.

Osiander. Der Montcenis bei den Alten. 4to. 60 pp. Cannstadt.

Persius. Küster (H.) De A. Persii Flacci elocutione quaestiones. 3 parts. 8vo. 24, 24, 23 pp. Löbau. 1 Mk. 50.

Phaedrus. Vandaele (H.) Qua mente Phaeder fabellas scripserit. 8vo. iv, 105 pp. Paris.

Philoponi (Jo.) De opificio mundi libri vii. rec. Gualt. Reichardt. 8vo. xvi, 342 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 4 Mk.

Plautus (Des T. Maccius) ausgewählte Komoedien. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von Jul. Brix. Vol. II. Captivi. 5th edition, by M. Niemeyer. 8vo. vi, 114 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk.

Plini Secundi (C.) Naturalis historiae libri xxxvii. Post Lud. Jani obitum recognovit et scripturae discrepantia adiecta ed. C. Mayhoff. Vol. V. (Libri xxxi.–xxxvii.) 12mo. x, 512 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 6 Mk.

Plinius. Münzer (F.) Beiträge zur Quellenkritik der Naturgeschichte des Plinius. 8vo. xi, 432 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 12 Mk.

Prášek (J. V.) Forschungen zur Geschichte des Alterthums: I. Kambyses und die Ueberlieferung des Alterthums. 8vo. 84 pp. Leipzig, Pfeiffer. 6 Mk.

Reichel (W.) Ueber vorhellenische Götterculte. 8vo. v, 98 pp. 39 engravings. Wien, Hölder. 4 Mk.

Sallustii libri qui est de bello Jugurthino partem extremam (103–112) ad optimos codices rec., emend. Jo. Wirz. Mit Prolegomena über die handschriftliche Grundlage und Epilegomena zur Textkritik. 4to. 38 pp. Zürich, Faesi and B. 1 Mk. 20.

—— Catilina und Auswahl aus dem Jugurtha. Für den Schulgebrauch herausgegeben von P. Klimek. Text. 8vo. ix, 139 pp. 2 maps. Münster, Aschendorff. 1 Mk. 10.

Schwartz (Wilh.) Die altgriechischen Schlangengottheiten, ein Beispiel der Anlehnung altheidnischen Volksglaubens an die Natur. 1858. Reprint. 4to. 34 pp. Berlin, Besser. 1 Mk. 20.

Seneca. Kunz (F.) Sentenzen in Seneca's Tragoedien. 8vo. 38 pp. Wiener-Neustadt.

Sophocles. Kaibel (G.) De Sophoclis Antigone. 8vo. 27 pp. Göttingen.

Stesichorus. Paulcke (M.) De tabula Iliaca quaestiones Stesichoreae. 8vo. 109 pp. 1 Plate. Königsberg.

Stobaeus. Pflieger (T.) Musonius bei Stobaeus. 4to. 27 pp. Tauberbischofsheim.

Stürenburg (H.) Die Bezeichnung der Flussufer bei Griechen und Römern. 4to. 45 pp. Dresden, Zahn. 1 Mk. 20.

Tacitus. Dienel (Rich.) Untersuchungen über den Taciteischen Rednerdialog. 8vo. 20 pp. St. Pölten. 40 Pf.

Terentius. Rabbow (P.) De Donati commento in Terentium specimen observationum primum. 8vo. 37 pp. Bonn.

Theocritus. Wahlin (Lars) De usu modorum Theocriteo. 8vo. iv, 44 pp. Gothenburg, Wettergren. 1 Mk. 10.

Theophrast's Charactere, herausgegeben, erklärt und übersetzt von der philologischen Gesellschaft zu Leipzig. 8vo. lxiv, 276 pp. 14 engravings. Leipzig, Teubner. 6 Mk.

Thiele (G.) De antiquorum libris pictis capita quattuor. 8vo. 43 pp. Marburg.

Tibullus. Untersuchung und Text von H. Belling. 2 parts. 8vo. vii, 412, vii, 56 pp. Berlin, Gaertner. 9 Mk.

Usener (H.) Der Stoff des griechischen Epos. (Aus 'Sitzungsberichten der K. K. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien.') 8vo. 63 pp. Wien, Gerold. 1 Mk. 50.

Virgilius. Nolhac (P. de) Le Virgile du Vatican et ses peintures. 4to. 113 pp. 1 plate. Paris, Klincksieck.

Wattenbach (W.) Scripturae graecae specimina, in usum scholarum collegit et explicavit. Libri cui inscriptum erat: Schrifttafeln zur Geschichte der griechischen Schrift. Editio III. Folio. 35 plates, 17 pp. of letterpress. Berlin, Grote. 16 Mk.

Ziegel (H.) De is et hic pronominibus quatenus confusa sint apud antiquos. 8vo. 67 pp. Marburg.

INDEX.

Note.—In the General Index names of actual contributors, in the Index Locorum references to passages discussed, are printed in heavy type.

I.—GENERAL INDEX.[1]

A.

abiegnus (cp. *iligneus, salignus*), 299*a*
Aboniteichos Ionopolis, coin of Trebonianus Gallus at, 227*a*
accentuation, a question in, 261*a*, *b*
accusative with infinitive, some remarks on the, 373 ff.
Achradina, position of, 363*a*, *b*
aciem defigere, 329*a*
Acta Apostolorum, Blass', noticed, 317 ff.
Acta Apostolorum secundum formam quae videtur Romanam, Blass', noticed, *ib.*
S. Luke's double recension of (?), 318 ff.
variants in, *ib.*
ad in *ad Opis* and similar expressions, the meaning of, 111 f.
ad Opis and similar expressions, the meaning of *ad* in, *ib.*
Adam (**J.**), emendations of Plato *Rep.* ix. (580 D) and iii. (390 A), 349 f.
Adversaria in Aeschylum, Blaydes', noticed, 56 ff.
aes, 146*a*
Aeschylus and Greek ritual, 297*a*
and Homer, 95*a*
and Seneca, 97*a*, *b*
and Sophocles *Aias*, 113*a*
and the Erinyes, 264 f.
Agam. (69 *sqq.*), on the interpretation of, 293 ff.
(735), a correction in, 448 f.
time occupied in, 130*b*
Agamemnonca, 94 ff., 403 ff.
Blaydes' *Adversaria* on, noticed, 56 ff.
epic influence in, 275*a*, *b*
Prom. (358), note on, 98*a*, *b*
Aesica (Great Chesters), excavations at, 415*a*
Aetna, MSS. of, 175*a*
Afrique Romaine (*L'*) *; Promenades archéologiques en Algérie et en Tunisie*, Boissier's, noticed, 127*a*, *b*
Agamemnonca, 94 ff., 403 ff.
Agar (**T. L.**), note on Homer *Il.* (xx. 18), 101*a*, *b*
notice of Hartman's *Epistola Critica*, 120 ff.
on the fourth thesis of the Homeric hexameter, 29 ff.
on the word διήφυσε in Homer, 445 ff.
Agathyrsi, land of the, 281*b*
origin of the, 282*a* (n.)
agere artes, 355*b*
Agesilaus of Xenophon, critical notes on the, 332 ff.
agmen (*examen*), 299*a*
Agni, the Vedic, 13*b*
Agricola and Ireland, 328*b* (n.), 447*a*
Agricola of Tacitus (24), note on the, 447*a*, *b*
notes on the, 325 ff.
Aigai (Aeolis), bronze coin of, 227*b*
√*aj* ('drive', 'shoot'), 13*b*, 89*b*
Albani bust, the, 125*a*
Alexander of Macedon, as an organizer, 316*b*
contrasted with Philip, 315*a*
main design of, 316*b*
Allbutt (**T. Clifford**), notice of recent edd. of Hippocrates, 162 ff.
alle beide (*tous deux, tous les deux*), 144*a*
Allen (**F. D.**), note on Sophocles *Trach.* (781 *sq.*), 259 f.
notice of Brenous' *Étude sur les Hellénismes dans la Syntaxe Latine*, 160 ff.
Allen (Frederic de Forest), obituary notice of, 413 f.
Allen (**Thomas W.**), *Hesiodea*, 396 ff.
notice of Ludwich's ed. of the *Batrachomachia*, 165 ff.
altrimodus, 441*a*
Amastris, coin of representing Hermes, 227*a*
Amisos, coin of representing Tyche, *ib.*
ἀμφότεροι in later Greek, 393 ff.
Anderson (J. G. C.), researches of in Asia Minor, 461*a*, *b*
Anderson (**W. C. F.**), notice of Boissier's *L'Afrique Romaine*, 127*a*, *b*
notice of Boissier's *Nouvelles Promenades* ('The Country of Horace and Virgil'), 127 f.
notice of Marriott's *Facts about Pomp i ; its Masons' Marks* &c., 126 f.
notice of Schneider's *Das Alte Rom*, 126*a*, *b*
antes (*antae*), 398*b*
Anthologia Latina, Buecheler-Reise's, noticed, 353 ff.
ἀπέλλαι (Hesych.), etymology of, 144*a*, *b*
Aphrodisias, coin of, 276*a*
Apollo Derronaios, 416*b*
Hypakraios, 124*b*, 173*b*, 415*a*

[1] The Index is by W. F. R. Shilleto, M.A., formerly Foundation Scholar of Christ's College, Cambridge.

Apollonius' Homeric lexicon, fragment of an earlier ed. of, 390 ff.
aquila (*aquilo*), 92*a*, *b*
Archaeology, 70 ff., 123 ff., 172 ff., 221 ff., 275 f., 321 f., 365 ff., 415 f., 458 ff.
Archeologia Leggendaria, De Nino's, noticed, 69*a*, *b*
Archestratus and Matro, 165*b*
Arezzo, vase-finds at, 276*b*
Aristides and the battle of Salamis, 258 f.
  decree of (479 B.C.), 218*a*, *b*
    Plutarch and Aristotle on, *ib.*
Aristophanes and the rites of Eleusis, 265*b*
  Ranae (1435 *sqq.*), note on, 302 f.
    original suggestion of plot, 356*a*
    probable confusion of the two edd. of, 303*a*, *b* (see also 356*a*, 357*b*)
    van Leeuwen's ed. of, noticed, 355 ff.
Aristotle and the decree of Aristides, 218*a*, *b*
  Poet. (xxv. 6), note on, 300 ff.
  quotations from Homer, 130*a*
Arnim's (von) *De Platonis Dialogis Quaestiones Chronologicae*, noticed, 63*a*, *b*
  Dionis Prusaensis, quem vocant Chrysostomum, quae exstant, noticed, 362*a*, *b*
Ars Tragica Sophoclea cum Shaksperiana comparata, Horton-Smith's, noticed, 119 f.
Arrhephori, the, 173*b*, 415*a*, *b* (n.)
Arval brethren, song of the, 354*b*
Asia Minor, Anderson's researches in, 461*a*, *b*
'asyndeton bimembre,' the, 325*a*, 327*a*, *b*
Atena (Lucania), inscribed *cippus* at, 367*b*, 368*a*
Athena Nike, little temple of, 415*b*
Athene-Mentes, speech of (Hom. *Od.* i. 253 *sqq.*), 290 ff.
Athenian constitution, the, 217*b*
Athens, discoveries at, 83*a*, 173*b*, 174*a*, 415*a*, *b*, 460*b*, 461*a*
Athos fragment of Paeanius' transl. of Eutropius, 382 ff.
Attic influence largely due to the Socratics, 61*b*
Aurelius, the column of, 221 ff.
Ausonius, a borrower from Juvenal, 260 f.
  (?) *Idyll.* 13, note on, 260 *a*, *b*
  notes on, 260 f.
αὐτίκα, unrecorded uses of, 442 ff.

B.

Babelon's *Les Origines de la Monnaie*, noticed, 172 f.
Bacchylides, Kenyon's *editio princeps* of, noticed, 449 ff.
Bacucco (Picenum), terracotta altar at, 276*b*
Bagis, coin of, 322*b*
Baiae, inscribed *cippus* at, 367*b*
Barton quoted, 268*a*
Basciano, prehistoric tomb at, 276*b*
basketry for cooking-utensils, 298*a*, 299*a*
Bassus (Sex. Lucilius), typical summary of in the Roman *Prosopographia*, 457*a*, *b*
Bastarnae, the, 223*a*
bath, the Roman, 73*b*
Bather (A. G.), notice of Jex-Blake and Sellers' *The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art*, noticed, 458 ff.
Batrachomachia, the, a Byzantine schoolbook, 165*b*
  and Pigres, 165*a*, *b*
  date of, 165*b*
  Ludwich's ed. of, noticed, 165 ff.
  MSS. of, 165*b*, 166*a*
  text of, 166*a*, *b*
  title of, 165*a*
  transpositions in, 167*b*
Bellona (Bellonarii), 289*b*
Berber race, the, 127*b*
Bibliography, 85 ff., 131 f., 175 f., 228, 323 f., 370 ff., 462 ff.
Blass' *Acta Apostolorum* (Editio philologica apparatu critico, commentario perpetuo, indice verborum illustrata), noticed, 317 ff.
  Acta Apostolorum secundum formam quae videtur Romanam, noticed, *ib.*
Blaydes' *Adversaria in Aeschylum*, noticed, 56 ff.
Bluemner-Hitzig's *Pausaniae Graeciae Descriptio* (Liber primus; Attica), noticed, 123 f.
Boissier's *L'Afrique Romaine; Promenades archéologiques en Algérie et en Tunisie*, noticed, 127*a*, *b*
  Nouvelles Promenades ('The Country of Horace and Virgil'), transl. of, noticed, 127 f.
Boden (Canton Aargau), excavations at, 415*a*
Bologna, mosaic pavement at, 226*a*
Bolsena, *vasi dorati* (*inargentati*) at, 276*b*
Bornecque's *M. Tullii Ciceronis Oratio in Verrem de Signis*, noticed, 124 f.
Boutkowski (Alexandre), estimate of, 226*b*
Brenous' *Etude sur les Hellénismes dans la Syntaxe Latine*, noticed, 160 ff.
British Museum, Catalogue of Greek coins in the, 275 f.
Brugmann's Law, 322*b*, 323*a*
Bruhn's *Iphigenie auf Tauris*, noticed, 212 ff.
Brundisium, Sulla's grant of *immunitas* to, 251 ff.
bubia, 85*a*
Buck (Carl D.), on the genitives ΤλᾱσίᾱFο and ΠασιάδᾱFο, 190 f. (see also 307*a*, *b*)
Buecheler-Reise's *Anthologia Latina*, noticed, 353 ff.
Bunbury (Sir E. H.), on the Sabines, 339*a* (n.)
burial customs among the Romans [see *Cl. Rev.* x. 395*a*]—Granger on, 32 f.; Warde Fowler on, 33 ff.
Burns quoted, 268*a*, 397*a*
Burrows (Ronald M.), on Aristides and the battle of Salamis, 258 f.
  on Pylos and Sphacteria [see *Cl. Rev.* x. 371 ff.] —a reply to Mr. Grundy, 1 ff.
    correction by, 131*a*, *b*
Bury (J. B.), notice of Krumbacher's *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur*, 207 ff.
  on a correction in Aeschylus *Agam.* (735), 448 f.
  on *ἀμφότεροι* in later Greek, 393 ff.
  on the European expedition of Darius, 277 ff.
Byzantine literature, Krumbacher on, noticed, 207 ff.
  period, papyri of the, 407*a*
  themes, the, 394*a*

C.

Caecilius of Calacte and Longinus *de Subl.* (ix. 9), 434*a*, *b*
Calderini, Petersen and von Domaszewski's *Die Marcussäule*, noticed, 221 ff.
Cambridge, coin-find near, 416*a*
Campbell (Lewis), notice of Diel's ed. of Parmenides, 409*a*, *b*
  notice of Horton-Smith's essay on Sophocles and Shakespeare, 119 f.
  notice of Kaibel's *De Sophoclis Antigona*, 456*a*, *b*
  notice of von Arnim's *De Platonis Dialogis Quaestiones Chronologicae*, 63*a*, *b*
campteres, 458*b*, 459*a*
cannibalism and the Thyestean myth, 97*b*
cantica and scene-headings in Plautus, 250*b*
Carian coins of Hecatomnus and Mausolus, attribution of, 275*b*
Carpus (*carpere*), 323*b*
Cartault's *Etude sur les Bucoliques de Virgile*, noticed, 269*a*, *b*
Carthage, excavations in the amphitheatre at, 415*b*

Caruselli's *Sulle Origini dei popoli Italici*, noticed, 458*a*, *b*
Catalogue of Greek Coins in the British Museum, Head's, noticed, 275 f.
Catania, late Roman necropolis at, 368*a*
catholicus, 441*b*
Catulus of Parma, 282 f.
cerus manus, 14*a*
'Chalcidian' vases, 321*a*
Chambers (C. D.), on the construction of *οὐ μή*, 109 ff.
Chaucer referred to, 283*b*
choliambic verse, 150*b*
Christ's *Pindari Carmina prolegomenis et commentariis instructa*, noticed, 59 ff.
Christie (Richard C.), on the first appearance in print of the first *Idyll* of Moschus, 191 f.
chronological order of Plato's Dialogues, the, 63*a*, *b* (see also 284 ff.)
Chrysostom, MSS. of, 362*a*, *b*
von Arnim's ed. of, noticed, *ib.*
Church influence on the non-discovery of literary papyri (?), 453*a*, *b*
Cicero and the lex Porcia, 438 ff.
de Oratore i., critical notes on, 22 ff.
de Signis, Bornecque's ed. of, noticed, 124 f.
epp. ad Att. (v. 19, 2), note on, 305*a*, *b*
and the Mediceus, 323*a*
epp. ad Fam. (i. 1, 2 : i. 2, 2), notes on, 108 f., 244 ff.
notes on, 350 f.
pro Sestio, notes on, 303 f.
three new fragments of, 206*a*, *b* (see also 261*a*, *b*)
Civita Alba (near Arcevia), Etrusco-Gallic temple at, 415*a*
Clement of Alexandria, uses of *αὐτίκα* in, 442 ff.
Clerici's *I tre Poemi, Iliade, Odissea, Eneide*, noticed by M. H., 364 f.
Codex Bezae and the *Acts*, the, 318*a*
Codex of Paeanius, a new, 382 ff.
'Codex Turnebi' of Plautus, discovery of a collation of the lost, 177 ff., 246 ff.
coeptus, 145*a*
Cohn's *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt* (vol. i.), noticed, 66 f.
coins from Pondoland, ancient, 365 ff.
in the British Museum, Greek, 275 f.
of the gens Porcia, 437 f.
explanation of one type, 440*b*
Collignon's *Histoire de la Sculpture grecque* (vol. ii.), noticed, 70 ff.
Cologna (Venetia), discoveries at, 276*a*, *b*
coloniae and *municipia*, 252*b*, 253*a*
columbaria, 33*b*
columen, 85*a*
Column of Aurelius)(Column of Trajan, 221 ff.
importance and interesting scenes of, 222*a*, *b*
Comici Graeci, conjectures in the Text of the, 16 f.
Concordance to the Greek Testament, Moulton-Geden's, noticed, 359 ff.
conferre fretum, 38*b*
conjectures in the Text of the *Comici Graeci*, 16 f.
Constantine, copper coin of from Pondoland, 367*a*
Constitutions of Xenophon, critical notes on the, 133 ff., 229 ff.
construction of *οὐ μή*, the, 109 ff.
contested etymologies, 12 ff., 89 ff., 143 ff.
Conway (R. Seymour), notice of Caruselli's *Sulle Origini dei popoli Italici*, 458*a*, *b*
notice of De Nino's *Archeologia Leggendaria*, 69*a*, *b*
Conybeare (Fred. C.), notice of Cohn's ed. of Philo (vol. i.), 66 f.
corcotarii, 145*a*
Corinthian vases, 321*a*, *b*
Corpus Papyrorum Raineri (vol. i.), Wessely's, noticed by H., 118*a*, *b*
correctors' hands in MSS., 408*b*
cortina (*cortex*), etymology of, 298 ff.
Country of Horace and Virgil, The—Boissier's 'Nouvelles Promenades,' transl. of, noticed, 127 f.
Cretan pottery and Egypt, 76*a*, *b*, 129*a*, 225*a*
Critias, the lost 'Ομιλίαι of, 62*a*
critical notes on Cicero *de Oratore* i., 22 ff.
on Ovid *Heroides* 102 ff., 200 ff., 238 ff., 286 ff., 425 ff.
on the Minor Works of Xenophon, 17 ff., 133 ff., 229 ff., 332 ff., 418 ff.
Croesus, coinage of, 172*a*, 173*a*
crudus, 400*a*, *b*
C. Suetoni Tranquilli Divus Augustus, Shuckburgh's ed. of, noticed, 63 f.
C. Suetonii Tranquilli Vita Divi Claudii, Smilda's ed. of, noticed, 64 f.
√*çā*, 145 f.
Curae Statianae, Klotz', noticed, 46 f.
Curtius (vi. 4, 7), note on, 26*a*, *b*
Cyprian *ĭ* (='or'), 349*a*, *b*
Cyprian, *notae Tironianae* attributed to, 306*a*, *b*
quotations from the *Acts*, 318*a*
Cyzicus and Phocaea, early coins of, 172*b*

D.

Daldis Flaviopolis, coins of, 322*b*
Damophon, work and date of, 71*b*
Damsté (P. H.), note on Curtius (vi. 4, 7), 26*a*, *b*
Darius and Histiaeus, 278*b*, 279*a*
and the reduction of Thrace, 278*a*
and the Scythian expedition, 277 ff.
his object, 281 f.
Das Alte Rom, Schneider's, noticed, 126*a*, *b*
Das Schriftwesen im Mittelalter, Wattenbach's, noticed, 411 f.
date of Tyrtaeus and the Messenian War, the, 10 ff., 185 ff.
dative of the possessor, the, 142 f.
(*de*) *alieno stomacho*, 206*a*, *b*
debate in the Senate as to the restoration of Ptolemy Auletes (56 B.C.), 108 f. (see also 241 ff.)
decorare (aliquem), 332*b*
De Ectypis quibusdam aeneis quae falso vocantur 'Argivo-Corinthiaca,' de Ridder's, noticed, 321*a*, *b*
deloccati senes, 45*a*
De l'Authenticité des Épigrammes de Simonide, Hauvette's, noticed, 170 f.
De l'Idée de la Mort en Grèce à l'Époque classique, de Ridder's, noticed, 262 ff.
Delphi, inscriptions at, 174*a*, *b*
theatre at, 174*b*
Delphic hymn, the second, 364*a*, *b*
Demetrius Magnes and Xenophon's works, 232*b*, 233*a*
De Nino's *Archeologia Leggendaria*, noticed, 69*a*, *b*
de nostro saeculo (=*de notre siècle*), 261*b*
dependent accusative with infinitive, construction of the, 376 f.
deperire (aliquem), 268*a*
De Platonis Dialogis Quaestiones Chronologicae, von Arnim's, noticed, 63*a*, *b*
Der Dialog. Ein literarhistorischer Versuch, Hirzel's, noticed, 61 f.
De Re Equestri of Xenophon, critical notes on the, 20 f.
De Ridder's *De Ectypis quibusdam aeneis quae falso vocantur 'Argivo-Corinthiaca,'* noticed, 321*a*, *b*
De l'Idée de la Mort en Grèce à l'Époque classique, noticed, 262 ff.
Derroni, coins of the, 227*b*, 416*b*

De Saussure's 'loi rythmique,' 93*a* (and n.)
De Sophoclis Antigona, Kaibel's, noticed, 456*a*, *b*
Dessau-Klebs' *Prosopographia Imperii Romani Sacc.* I., II., III., noticed, 457*a*, *b*
De Sublimitate (ix. 9), the quotation from *Genesis* in, 431ff.
De tribus Homeri Odysseae codicibus antiquissimis, Molhuysen's, noticed, 273ff.
diaeresis at every foot in Latin metres, 148ff.
Dialogus de Oratoribus, authorship of the, 174*a*
Dibáki find, Evans on the, 76*a*, *b*, 129*a*
Didache (i. 2) and *Acts* (xv. 20, 29), note on, 147f.
and Western text of the *Acts*, *ib.*
Die Figur der Hyperbel in den Gedichten Vergils, Hunziker's, noticed, 266ff.
Die homerische Batrachomachia des Karers Pigres nebst Scholien und Paraphrase, Ludwich's, noticed, 165ff.
Diels' *Parmenides*: Lehrgedicht: griechisch und deutsch, noticed, 409*a*, *b*
Die Marcussäule, Petersen, von Domaszewski and Calderini's, noticed, 221ff.
διήφυσε, the Homeric, 445ff.
dignus, 298*a*
Diodorus and Xenophon's works, 233*a*
Diogenes Laertius and Xenophon's works, 232*b*, 233*a*
Diomedes and Suetonius, 369*a*
Dionis Prusaensis, quem vocant Chrysostomum, quae exstant, von Arnim's, noticed, 362*a*, *b*
discovery of a collation of the lost 'Codex Turnebi' of Plautus, 177ff., 246ff.
Domaszewski (von), Petersen and Calderini's *Die Marcussäule*, noticed, 221ff.
'Douaren' readings of Plautus, 177ff.
Dryden quoted, 268*a*
ducere (=*cdere*), 326*a*
Duris in Pliny, 460*a*, *b*
Dyer (Louis), notice of Thomas' *Rome et l'Empire aux deux premiers siècles de notre ère*, 72ff.

E.

Earle (Mortimer Lamson), critical notes on Cicero *de Oratore* i., 22 ff.
note on Plato *Symp.* (179 C), 159*a*, *b*
on two passages in Homer, 242 f.
earlier ed. of Apollonius' Homeric lexicon, fragment of an, 390 ff.
earliest appearance in print of the first *Idyll* of Moschus, 191 f.
Greek printing, 191*b*, 192*a*
early Epic, elisions in the, 31*a*
Greek bronze reliefs, 321*a*, *b*
'echoing subjunctive,' the, 345*a*, *b*
ecliptica signa, 312*a*
ecquis, 220*a*
Egbert's *Introduction to the Study of Latin Inscriptions*, noticed, 67 ff.
ἐγώ, a use of, 318 ff.
Egyptian and Greek pottery, the question of, 74 ff.
system of taxation, 49 f., 55*b*
chronology, 78 ff., 129*b*
kings and their dates, 81 f., 129*b*
Ehrhard's collaboration in Krumbacher's *Byzantine Literature*, 207*b*
electrum coinage, early history of the, 172*b*, 173*a*
Eleutherae, the bronze relief from, 321*b*
elisions in the early Epic, 31*a*
Ἑλλήνων προμαχοῦντες κ.τ.λ., the epigram, 171*a*
Ellis (Robinson), emendations of Lucretius, 204 f.
notes on the newly-discovered fragment of Menander's Γεωργός, 417 f. (see also 453 ff.)
Ellis (Robinson)—*continued.*
notice of Lafaye's Notes on Statius *Silvae* i. and Klotz' *Curae Statianae*, 43 ff.
on an epigram of Leonidas of Tarentum (*A.P.* ix. 335), 100*a*, *b*
embaenitica, 367*b*
emendations of Lucretius, 204 f.
en (*ecce*) with accusative, 375*b*
enecare taedio (aliquem), 268*a*
Enneacrunus, position of the, 123 *b*
Ephesus, coins of, 276*a*
excavations at, 368*b*
epigram of Leonidas of Tarentum, an, 100*a*, *b*
Epistola Critica, Hartman's, noticed, 120 ff.
Epitynchanos, 136*b*, 137*a*
eques (=*equus*), 85*b*
equidem, 220*a*
erceptio, 125*b*
ergenna (=*sacerdos*), 84*b*
Erinyes and the Areopagus, the, 264 f.
etiam in Plautus, 461*b*
Etude sur les Bucoliques de Virgile, Cartault's, noticed, 269*a*, *b*
Étude sur les Hellénismes dans la Syntaxe Latine, Brenous', noticed, 160 ff.
etymologies, contested, 12 ff., 89 ff., 143 ff.
dangers of, 458*a*, *b*
etymology of ἀπέλλαι (Hesych.), 144*a*, *b*
of *cortina* (*cortex*), 298 ff.
of *frequens*, 144 ff.
of *immanis*, 13*a*, *b*
of *ingens*, 12 f., 300*a*, *b*
of *manus* (*di manes*), 13 f.
of *mas* (*Mars*), 14 f.
of ὄαρ (*soror*), 146 f.
of ὄβριμος (or ὕμβριμος), 89*a*, *b*
of *simpulus* (*simpuvium*), 147*a*, *b*
of *vicissim*, 144*a*
of *viçva* (Sk.), 143 f.
Euripides *Alcestis* (320 *sqq.*), note on, 107*a*, *b* (see also 304 f.)
and Sophocles (*ap.* Aristotle), 300 ff.
Iph. in Tauris, Bruhn's ed. of, noticed, 212 ff.
European expedition of Darius, the, 277 ff.
Euthydemus, epilogue to the, 62*a*
Eutropius, fragments from Paeanius' transl. of, 382 ff.
exsequias ire, 144*b*
exsilium and the lex Porcia, 438*a*, *b* (and n.)

F.

Facts about Pompei; its Masons' Marks, &c., Marriott's, noticed, 126 f.
farcio (φράσσω), 144*b*
Farnell (Lewis R.), on the interpretation of Aeschylus *Agam.* 69 *sqq.* (A Paper read at the Oxford Philological Society), 293 ff.
Fay (Edwin W.), on contested etymologies, 12 ff., 89 ff., 143 ff.
on partial obliquity in questions of retort, 344 f.
on the etymology of *cortina* (*cortex*), 298 ff.
on the ironical use of *nc* in parenthetic purpose-clauses, 346*a*, *b*
Fennell (C. A. M.), on the etymology of *ingens*, 300*a*, *b* (see also 12 f.)
femur (πῆχυς), 13*a*, 14*b*, 299*a*, *b*
fenum, 13*b*, 298*a*, *b*
fenus, 13*b*, 298*a*
final and predicative dative, construction of the, 373*a*, *b*
Fleury codex of N.T. and the *Acts*, the, 318*a*
Florence, Roman remains at, 367*b*
fluvius (*flumen*), 13*a*

folklore in Italy, 69*a*, *b*
fourth thesis of the Homeric hexameter, the, 151 ff.
Fowler (W. Warde), on Róman burial, 33 ff.
fragment of an earlier ed. of Apollonius' Homeric lexicon, 390 ff.
of Menander's Γεωργός, the newly-discovered, 417 f., 453 ff.
'Fragmenta Senonensia' of Plautus, 177 ff.
Fragmentum Cyclici Incerti, 365*a*, *b*
fragments from Paeanius' transl. of Eutropius, new unedited, 382 ff.
of Cicero, three new, 206*a*, *b* (see also 261*a*, *b*)
of Macrobius' *Saturnalia*, 441*a*, *b*
Francken (C. M.), *Lucanus* (*ad censuram* W. E. Heitland), 180 ff.
Francken's *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia*, noticed, 35 ff.
author's rejoinder to the above, 180 ff.
reply of reviewer, 257 f.
Franklin's *Traces of Epic Influence in the Tragedies of Aeschylus*, noticed, 275*a*, *b*
Freeman's *Sicily*, Lupus' transl. of, noticed, 362 f.
frequens, etymology of, 144 ff.
senatus, 144*b*, 145*a*
Fronto and Plutarch, 305 f.
Fuchs' *Hippocrates, Sämmtliche Werke*, noticed, 163 f.
Fulgentius the Mythographer and the *super Thebaide*, 323*a*
fulgor, *fulgus*, *fulmen*, 14*b*
funeral monuments of Attica, the, 262*b*
Furtwaengler on early Greek bronze reliefs, 321*a*

G.

Galbianus, 85*b*
Gallienus and Salonina, gold medallion of, 226*b*
Gardner (Ernest), notice of Hitzig-Bluemner's *Pausaniae Graeciae Descriptio* i., 123 f.
Gardner's *A Handbook of Greek Sculpture* (Part II.), noticed, 223 f.
Gardner (Percy), notice of Babelon's *Les Origines de la Monnaie*, 172 f.
notice of Collignon's *Histoire de la Sculpture grecque* (vol. ii.), 70 ff.
notice of Head's *Catalogue of Greek Coins in the British Museum*, 275 f.
notice of Petersen, von Domaszewski and Calderini's *Die Marcussäule*, 221 ff.
gavia, 304*b*
Geden-Moulton's *A Concordance to the Greek Testament according to the Texts of Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf and the English Revisers*, noticed, 359 ff.
Gela inscription, the, 190*a*, 191*b*
Gelzer's collaboration in Krumbacher's *Byzantine Literature*, 207*b*
Genesis quotation in the *de Sublimitate* (ix. 9), the, 431 ff.
genitives, some Homeric, 255 ff.
ΤλᾱσίᾱFο and ΠασιάδᾱFο, the, 190 f. (see also 307*a*, *b*)
Gerhard on the fourth thesis of the Greek hexameter, 152*a*
Germe, coins of, 322*b*
gerundive of purpose, the, 160*b*
Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur, Krumbacher's, noticed, 207 ff.
Geschichte Siciliens, Lupus' (transl. from Freeman's *Sicily*), noticed, 362 f.
Gevaert's *La Mélopée antique dans le Chant de l'Église latine*, noticed, 364*a*, *b*
Goethe's *obiter dictum* on Sophocles *Ant.* (891—928), 456*a*
graba (=*caput*), 85*a*
Granger (Frank), on Roman burial, 32 f.
grant of *immunitas* to Brundisium, the, 251 ff.
'grave of Erechtheus,' the, 415*a*
Gray (J. H.), notes on Plautus *Epid.* (19, 625), 106*a*, *b*
notice of McCosh's ed. of Plautus *Bacchides*, 219 f.
Greek and Egyptian pottery, the question of, 74 ff.
system of taxation, 49 f., 55*b*
bronze reliefs, early (de Ritter), 321*a*, *b*
constitutional history (Greenidge), 216 ff.
earliest printing of, 191*b*, 192*a*
elegiacs (Platt), 70*b*
grammar, notes on (Humphreys), 138 ff.
iambics (Pollock), 365*a*, *b*
influence upon Latin, 160 ff.
metrical inscriptions from Phrygia (Souter), 31 f., 136 ff.
numbers, the addition of, 395*a*, *b* (and n.)
oligarchies, 217*a*
orthography (*e.g.* πράττειν for πράσσειν, σύν for ξύν), 231*b*
Papyri (Grenfell-Hunt's), 405 ff.
of Vienna (Wessely), 118*a*, *b*
sculpture (Collignon), 70 ff.
(Gardner, E. A.), 223 f.
modern restorations of, 72*a*
Testament, *Concordance to* (Moulton-Geden's), 359 ff.
Tragedy, a point of metre in, 341 ff.
Greene (Herbert W.), notes on Sophocles *Oed. Tyr.*, 199*a*, *b*
Greenidge (A. H. J.), on the Porcian coins and the Porcian laws, 437 ff.
Greenidge's *A Handbook of Greek Constitutional History*, noticed, 216 ff.
Grenfell's *Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus*, noticed, 47 ff.
Grenfell-Hunt's *Greek Papyri, Series II.: New Classical Fragments and other Greek and Latin Papyri*, noticed, 405 ff.
Gretton (R. H.), note on Cicero *ad Fam.* (i. 2, 2), 108 f. (see also 244 ff.)
grotto of Agraulos, the, 415*a*
grottoes of Apollo and Pan, the, 173*b*, 415*a*, 460*b*
Grundy (G. B.), on Pylos and Sphacteria, 155 ff.
addendum to, 158 f.
on the attack on Koryphasion, 448*a*, *b*
Gudeman (Alfred), notes on Tacitus *Agricola*, 325 ff.

H.

Haimilion, bronze coins at, 227*a*
Hale (W. G.), **Seymour (T. D.)**, and **Wright (J. H.)**, obituary notice of Professors Lane and Allen, 412 ff.
Hall (F. W.), notice of van Leeuwen's ed. of Aristophanes *Ranae*, 355 ff.
'Hamitic' family of peoples, the, 458*a*
Handbook of Greek Constitutional History, Greenidge's, noticed, 216 ff.
Handbook of Greek Sculpture, Gardner's, noticed, 223 f.
'haplolalia,' instances of, 90 ff.
Hartmann's *Epistola Critica ad amicos J. van Leeuwen et M. B. da Costa continens Annotationes ad Odysseam*, noticed, 120 ff.
haud (*οὐ*), origin of, 461*b*
Hauvette's *De l'Authenticité des Épigrammes de Simonide*, noticed, 170 f.
Haverfield (F.), note on Aeschylus *Prom.* (358), 98*a*, *b*
note on Tacitus *Agric.* (24), 447*a*, *b*

Haverfield (F.)—*continued.*
notice of Cartault's *Étude sur les Bucoliques de Virgile*, 269*a*, *b*
notice of Egbert's *Introduction to the Study of Latin Inscriptions*, 67 ff.
notice of Lupus' transl. of Freeman's *Sicily*, 362 f.
Hayley (H. W.), Miscellanea, 304 f.
notice of Franklin's *Traces of Epic Influence in the Tragedies of Aeschylus*, 275*a*, *b*
Head's *Catalogue of Greek Coins in the British Museum* (Caria, Cos, Rhodes, etc.), noticed, 275 f.
Headlam (Walter), notice of Blaydes' *Adversaria in Aeschylum*, 56 ff.
Heinze's *T. Lucretius Carus de rerum natura* (Buch iii.), noticed, 455 f.
Heitland (W. E.), note on Lucan (viii. 7), 206 f.
notice of Francken's ed. of Lucan, 35 ff.
author's rejoinder, 180 ff.
reply of reviewer, 257 f.
Hellenisms in Latin, 160 ff.
Henderson (Bernard W.), on Sulla's grant of *immunitas* to Brundisium, 251 ff.
Herakleia on the Sipylos, supposed coins of, 322*b*
Herennius Etruscus (Q.), inscription to, 457*b*
Hermes of Olympia, sculptor of the, 459*a*
Hermokapelia, supposed coin of, 322*b*
Herodes Atticus, ship of and the Panathenaic festival, 124*b*
Herodotus and the Miltiades family tradition, 278*b*, 279*a*
and the river-system of Roumania, 280*a*, *b*
Heroides, Ovid's, critical notes on, 102 ff., 200 ff., 238 ff., 286 ff., 425 ff.
Hesiod, edd. of, 396*a*
Hesiodea, 396 ff.
Hicks (R. D.), notice of Hirzel's *Der Dialog*, 61 f.
notice of van Oordt's *Plato and the Times he Lived in*, 116 f.
Hiero of Xenophon, critical notes on the, 17 ff.
Hill (G. F.), Monthly Record, 415*a*, *b*, 460 f.
notice of Gardner's *Handbook of Greek Sculpture*, 223 f.
on ancient coins from Pondoland, 365 ff.
Himera, 'value-signs' on coins of, 416*a*
Hipparchicus of Xenophon, critical notes on the, 19 f.
Hippocrates, date of writings of, 163*a*
Erotian's Glossary of, 164*a*, *b*
former edd. of, 162*b*, 163*b*
literary importance of, 163*a*, *b*
MSS. of, 162*b*
recent edd. of, noticed, 162 ff.
Hirzel's *Der Dialog. Ein literarhistorischer Versuch*, noticed, 61 f.
Histoire de la Sculpture grecque (vol. ii.), Collignon's, noticed, 70 ff.
'historical infinitive,' the, 374*b*
History of Rome to the Death of Caesar, How-Leigh's, noticed, 409 f.
Hitzig-Bluemner's *Pausaniae Graeciae Descriptio*, (Liber primus; Attica), noticed, 123 f.
Hogarth's *Philip and Alexander of Macedon*, noticed, 313 ff.
Hogg quoted, 268*a*
Holmes' *Index Lysiacus*, noticed, 411*a*, *b*
Holzhausen, Roman camp at, 367*a*
Homer and Virgil contrasted, 268*b*
Batrachomachia, Ludwich's ed. of, noticed, 165 ff.
Iliad i., Zuretti's ed. of, noticed, 220 f.
(i. 418) and *Od.* (xix. 234), notes on, 242 f.
(xx. 18), note on, 101*a*, *b*
periochae to, 167*b*
lives of, 221*a*
Homer and Virgil—*continued.*
Odyssey i., Zuretti's ed. of, noticed, 220 f.
(i. 253 *sqq.*) note on, 290 ff.
(iv. 544 *sqq.*), note on, 243 f.
MSS. of (Molhuysen), 273 ff.
papyri fragments, 406*a*, *b*
Homeric genitives, 255 ff.
hexameter, a question of metric in the [see *Cl. Rev.* x. 431 f.]:—
Agar on, 29 ff.
Mulvany on, 151 f.
Platt on, 152 ff.
Seaton on, 152*a*, *b*
Tyrrell on, 28*a*, *b*
lexicon, fragment of an earlier ed. of Apollonius', 390 ff.
word διήφυσε, the, 445 ff.
hominem impudicum, 375*b*
Horace, nationality of, 339 f.
Od. (i. 28), the possible division of, 444 f.
Odes, divisions of, 462*a*
Sat. i. 5, date of, 358*b*
Satires and Epistles, Kirkland's ed. of, noticed, 358 f.
horret (impersonal), 259*a*, *b*
Horton-Smith's *Ars Tragica Sophoclea cum Shakesperiana Comparata*, noticed, 119 f.
Housman (A. E.), critical notes on Ovid *Heroides*, 102 ff., 200 ff., 238 ff., 286 ff., 425 ff.
Housman's *Narcissus*, rendered into Greek Elegiacs, 70*a*, *b*
How-Leigh's *A History of Rome to the Death of Caesar*, noticed, 409 f.
Humphreys (Milton W.), notes on Greek grammar, 138 ff.
Hunt-Grenfell's *Greek Papyri, Series II.: New Classical Fragments and other Greek and Latin Papyri*, noticed, 405 ff.
Hunziker's *Die Figur der Hyperbel in den Gedichten Vergils*, noticed, 266 ff.
Hurd (Bishop), commentary of on Hor. *Ars Poet.*, 301*a*
Hypaipa, coins of, 322*b*
hypallage, the 'exploded figment of scholiasts,' 60*b*
hyperbaton in Ovid, 428 f.
hyperbole in Vergil, 266 ff.

I. J.

ictus and *ignis*, 13*a*, *b*, 298*b*
partic. of *iacere*, 13*a*
Idalium inscription, Υ in the, 349*a*, *b*
Jebb's ed. of Sophocles, criticisms on, 192 ff.
ed. of the *Ajax*, noticed, 113 ff.
iecur, *iecusculum* (ἧπαρ-τος), 14*b*
Jex-Blake and Sellers' *The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art*, noticed, 458 ff.
ignis and *agere*, 13*b* (and n.), 298*b*
and *lignum*, 13*a*
and *ictus*, 13*a*, *b*, 298*b*
Ilberg's *Das Hippocrates-Glossar des Erotianos und seine ursprungliche Gestalt*, noticed, 164*a*, *b*
Prolegomena Critica in Hippocratis Opera quae feruntur omnia, noticed, 162 f.
immanis, etymology of, 13*a*, *b*
immunitas to Brundisium, Sulla's grant of, 251 ff.
Imola, discoveries at, 367*b*
imperfect, use of in Xenophon, 335*a*
inānis (and *immanis*), 13*a*
inciens, 145*b*, 146*a*
independent accusative with infinitive, construction of the, 374 ff.
Index Lysiacus, Holmes', noticed, 411*a*, *b*
Indo-European case in *-i* a possessive, the, 142 f.

Indra and Mars, 15*a*, *b*
influence of Greek upon Latin, 160 ff.
of one language upon another generally, 161*b*
ingens, etymology of, 12 f., 300*a*, *b*
in mundo, 130*b*
Introduction to Latin Textual Emendation, Lindsay's, noticed, 408*a*, *b*
Introduction to the Study of Latin Inscriptions, Egbert's, noticed, 67 ff.
John of Salisbury and Fronto, 305 f.
and Macrobius, 441*a*, *b*
Mai on, 306*a*, *b*
Policraticus, MSS. of, 282 f.
Jones (H. Stuart), notice of Gevaert's *La Mélopée antique dans le Chant de l'Église latine*, 364*a*, *b*
notice of Hauvette's *De l'Authenticité des Epigrammes de Simonide*, 170 f.
Josephus and Longinus, a resemblance between, 436*a*
Iphigenie auf Tauris, Bruhn's, noticed, 212 ff.
Ireland and Agricola, 328*b* (n.), 447*a*
ironical use of *ne* in purpose-clauses, 346*a*, *b*
'irony' in the drama, 119*b*
Italian edd. of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, 220 f.
School Classics, 364 f.
Italians, origin of the, 458*a*, *b*
I tre Poemi, Iliade, Odissea, Eneide, Clerici's, noticed by M. H., 364 f.
iudicium populi)(*provocatio*, 438*b* (n.)
ius Italicum, 252*b*, 253*a*
Juvenal (x. 82 *sqq.*), note on, 26 f.
and Ausonius, 260 f.
history of the text of, 402*b*
MSS. of, 402*a*, *b*
Satires i. and iii., on some passages in, 399 ff.

K.

Kahun pottery, the, 75*b*, 128*b*, 129*a*, 225*b*
καί, a use of, 140 f.
Kaibel's *De Sophoclis Antigona*, noticed, 456*a*, *b*
Kenyon (F. G.), notice of Grenfell-Hunt's *Greek Papyri, Series II.*, 405 ff.
notice of Nicole's *Le Labourcur de Ménandre*, 453 ff.
notice of Wattenbach's *Das Schriftwesen im Mittelalter*, 411 f.
Kenyon's *The Poems of Bacchylides* (from a Papyrus in the British Museum), noticed, 449 ff.
Kirkland's *Horace, Satires and Epistles* (based on Kiessling), noticed, 358 f.
Kirtland (J. C. jun.), note on *orator* ('petitioner,' 'suppliant'), 351 f.
note on Terence *Adelph.* (223 f.), 352 f.
Klebs-Dessau's *Prosopographia Imperii Romani Sacc.* I., II., III., noticed, 457*a*, *b*
Klotz' *Curae Statianae*, noticed, 46 f.
Knapp (Charles), notice of Kirkland's *Horace, Satires and Epistles*, 358 f.
Komana (Pontus), coins of representing Ma or Enyo, 227*a*
Konjica (Herzegovina), sanctuary of Mithras at, 226*b*
Koryphasion, the attack on (Thuc. iv. 13 : 23), 448*a*, *b*
Koster (Edward B.), notice of Hunziker's *Die Figur der Hyperbel in den Gedichten Vergils*, 266 ff.
Krumbacher's *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches* (527–1453), noticed, 207 ff.
Kuehlewein's *Hippocratis Opera quae feruntur omnia*, noticed, 162 f.
Kurion, Mycenaean necropolis at, 129*b*, 225*b*
Kyme (Aeolis), coins of representing the Sibyll, 227*b*

L.

l and *r*, interchange of in Sanskrit, 299*b* (and n.)
Lafaye's *Quelques Notes sur les Silvae de Stace, premier livre*, noticed, 43 ff.
Lake (K.), note on *Didache* (i. 2) and *Acts* (xv. 20, 29), 147 f.
Lambros (Spyr. P.), *Ein neuer Codex des Päanius*, 382 ff.
La Mélopée antique dans le Chant de l'Église latine, Gevaert's, noticed, 364*a*, *b*
Lane (George Martin), obituary notice of, 412 f.
Lang (Andrew), on the Magical papyri, 107 f.
Latin Hellenisms (Brenous), 160 ff.
inscriptions (Egbert), 67 ff.
metres, diaeresis in (Lease), 148 ff.
textual emendation (Lindsay), 408*a*, *b*
Law of Gortyna on the bride-price (ἔδνα), 292*b*
Lease (Emory B.), on diaeresis at every foot in Latin Hexameter, Phalaecean and Choliambic verse, 148 ff.
on the use of *numne*, 348 f.
Leeuwen's (van) *Aristophanis Ranae*, noticed, 355 ff.
Leigh-How's *A History of Rome to the death of Caesar*, noticed, 409 f.
Le Labourcur de Ménandre, Nicole's, noticed, 453 ff.
lemures, 35*a*
Lemuria, ritual of the, 33*a*, 35*a*
leno, lena (λάγνος), 13*b*, 298*a*
Leonidas of Tarentum, an epigram of (*A P.* ix. 335), 100*a*, *b*
Les Origines de la Monnaie, Babelon's, noticed, 172 f.
lex Caecilia and *portoria*, 253*b*
lex Porcia, 437 ff.
lex Valeria, 439 f.
libripens, 399*a*
lignum and *ignis*, 13*a*
and *ligare*, 298*a* (n.)
L'Iliade commentata da C. O. Zuretti (Libro Primo), noticed, 220 f.
Lindsay (W. M.), on the discovery of a collation of the lost 'Codex Turnebi' of Plautus, 177 ff., 246 ff.
Lindsay's *An Introduction to Latin Textual Emendation, based on the Text of Plautus*, noticed, 408*a*, *b*
L'Odissea commentata da C. O. Zuretti (Libro Primo), noticed, 220 f.
'Logia' fragment, the, 406*a*, 462*b*
Longinus *de Sublimitate* (ix. 9), the quotation from *Genesis* in, 431 ff.
date and authorship of, 433 ff.
Paris MS. of, 432*a*
Lucan (viii. 7), note on, 206 f.
(book vii.), Postgate's ed. of, noticed, 167 ff.
codices mutili (Pauline) and *codices vulgares* (non-Pauline) of, 36*b*, 42*a*
editors of, 35*a*
Francken and Hosius' record of the MSS. readings of, 36*b*, 37*b*, 38*a*
Francken's ed. of, noticed, 35 ff.
author's rejoinder to, 180 ff.
reply of reviewer, 257 f.
treatment of the MSS. readings, 36*b*, 37*a*
MSS. of, 35 f., 42*a*, *b*, 168*b*, 180 ff., 257 f.
orthography in, 43*b*
Ridley's transl. of, noticed, 270 ff.
title of work, 37*a*
transpositions and order of words in, 43*a*
Lucanus (*ad censuram* W. E. Heitland), Francken's, 180 ff.
luci claro, 408*b*
Lucian and Plutarch, parallel between, 62*b*

Lucretius (v. 436 *sqq.*), note on, 27 f.
(book iii.), Heinze's ed. of, noticed, 455 f.
corrections in the Venice ed. of, 307*a*, *b*
emendations of, 204 f.
Marullus' text of, 307*a*, *b*
Ludwich's *Die Homerische Batrachomachia des Karers Pigres nebst Scholien und Paraphrase*, noticed, 165 ff.
Luke's (St.) double recension (?) of the *Acts*, 318 ff.
luna, 298*b*
Lupus' *Geschichte Siciliens* (transl. of Freeman's *Sicily*), noticed, 362 f.
Lutoslawski (W.), on 'Stylometry' (Abstract of a Paper read at the Oxford Philological Society), 284 ff.
lux ('bliss,' 'salvation'), 268*a*
Lycophron, date of, 130*a*

M.

Macan (Reginald W.), on the date of Tyrtaeus and the Messenian War [see *Cl. Rev.* x. 269 ff.], 10 ff.
Verrall's reply to, 185 ff.
Macrobius and John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*, 441*a*, *b*
Saturnalia, fragments of, *ib.*
mâda (Sk.), 90*b*
Madrid MS. of Manilius, 308*a*
of Statius, 44*a*
Maghā. the month, and Maius, 12*b*, 13*a* (and n.)
Magical papyri, note on the, 107 f.
Mahaffy on the Revenue papyrus of Ptolemy Philadelphus, 47*a*, 48*b*, 52*b*
Mai on John of Salisbury and Fronto, 306*a*, *b*
Maine on the bride-price (ἕδνα), 292*b*
Malalas (Johannes), Chronicle of, 209 ff.
distinct from Johannes of Antioch, 209*b*
floruit of, *ib.*
identical with Johannes Rhetor, *ib.*
Manilius, Bechert and, 308*a*
Bentley and, 308*b*, 309*a*, *b*, 310*b*, 311*b*
Firmicus and, 313*a*, *b*
influence of Propertius on, 313*b*
Madrid MS. of, 308*a*
Milton and, *ib.*
readings of the Gembloux MS. of, 310*b*, 312*a*
Simcox and, 308*a*
Manlius and the *dilectus*, 440*b*
mannos (Ausonius), 261*b*
Mannus (the German) and Paulus' *cerus manus*, 14*a*
manus (*di manes*), etymology of, 13 f.
Marchant (E. C.), note on Ausonius (?) *Idyll.* (13), 260*a*, *b*
notes on Thucydides vi., 98 ff.
Marindin (G. E.), on the meaning of *ad* in *ad Opis* and similar expressions, 111 f.
on Xenophon's Πόροι (4, 52), 425*b* (see also 424*b*)
Markland's work on Statius, 44*a*
Marriott's *Facts about Pompei; its Masons' Marks, Town Walls, Houses and Portraits*, noticed, 126 f.
Mars and Indra, 15*a*, *b*
Marullus' text of Lucretius, 307*a*, *b*
Maruts, the, 15*b*
mas (*Mars*), etymology of, 14 f.
masons' marks in Pompei, 126 f.
Masson (J.), on Marullus' text of Lucretius, 307*a*, *b*
Matro and Archestratus, 165*b*
Mausoleum reliefs, the, 224*a*
sculptors of the, 71*a*
Mayor (John E. B.), on *horret* impersonal, 259*a*, *b*
on the sun's rays shining undefiled on filth, 449*a*, *b*
on three new fragments of Cicero, 206*a*, *b* (see also 261*a*, *b*)
Mayor (J. B.), notice of Moulton-Geden's *Concordance to the Greek Testament*, 359 ff.
on unrecorded uses of αὐτίκα, 442 ff.
McCosh's *Plauti Bacchides*, noticed, 219 f.
Meleager's Στέφανος, 170*a*, 171*b*
meminens, 84*b*
me miserum, 375*b*
Memphis and Mycenae, Torr's, author's reply to notice [see *Cl. Rev.* x. 447 ff.], 74 ff.
rejoinder of reviewer, 128 ff.
supplementary reply of author, 224 f.
Menander's Γεωργός, notes on the newly-discovered fragment of, 417 f. (see also 453 ff.)
Menecrates monument at Corfu, the, 190*a*, *b*
Mên Tiamu, 130*a*
mentio (*mentior*), 84*b*
Merrill (W. A.), notice of Heinze's ed. of Lucretius (book iii.), 455 f.
Merry (W. W.), note on Juvenal (x. 82 *sqq.*), 26 f.
Mesomedes' hymn to the Muse, the symbol Ν or Η in, 364*b*
Messenian War associated by Lycurgus with Tyrtaeus, date of, 11*a*, *b*
mē, *tē*)(μοι, τοι, 142*a*
Methymna, coin of representing Dionysos Φαλλήν, 227*b*
metrical inscriptions from Phrygia, Greek, 31 ff., 136 ff.
question in Greek Tragedy, a, 341 ff.
mī, illī etc.)(μοι, σοι etc., 142*b*
Miles (Eustace H.), on the dative of the possessor, 142 f.
milia, 91*b*, 92*a*
Milton quoted or referred to, 267*b*, 268*b*
Minerŭa, 84*b*
Minor Works of Xenophon, critical notes on the [*continued from* vol. x.]:—
III. The *Hiero*, 17 ff.
IV. The *Hipparchicus*, 19 f.
V. *De Re Equestri*, 20 f.
VI., VII. The *Constitutions*, 133 ff., 229 ff.
VIII. The *Agesilaus*, 332 ff.
IX. The *Ways and Means*, 418 ff.
Miscellanea (H. W. Hayley), 304 f.
√*mis*, 91*a*, *b*
mīs, tīs in Plautus, 174*b*
modern Greek newspapers, 161*b*
Modica, prehistoric burial-places at, 368*a*
modo si, 85*b*
Molhuysen's *De tribus Homeri Odysseae Codicibus antiquissimis*, noticed, 273 ff.
Mommsen on *Longinus de Sublimitate*, 436*a*, *b*
money, the first issues of, 172*a*
Montagu collection of Roman gold coins, the, 416*a*
Monthly Record, 82 f., 173 f., 226, 276, 367 f., 415 460 f.
Monumentum Ancyranum and Suetonius, the, 64*a*
Morris (W.) quoted, 267*b*
Moschus *Epitaphium Bionis* referred to, 268*b*
Idyll. i., earliest appearance of in print, 191 f.
Mossyna, supposed coins of, 322*b*
Moulton-Geden's *A Concordance to the Greek Testament according to the Texts of Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf and the English Revisers*, 359 ff.
MS. of Longinus *de Sublimitate*, the Paris, 432*a*
of Manilius, the Madrid, 308*a*
of Statius, the Madrid, 44*a*
MSS. of *Actna*, 175*a*
of Chrysostom, 362*a*, *b*
of Hippocrates, 162*b*
of Homer's *Batrachomachia*, 165*b*, 166*a*
Odyssey, 273 ff.
of John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*, 282 f.
of Juvenal, 402*a*, *b*

MSS. of *Aetna—continued.*
of Lucan, 35 f., 42*a*, *b*, 168*b*, 180 ff., 257 f.
of Ovid's *Heroides*, 102*b*
of Pausanias, 123*a*
of Philo, 66 f.
of Plautus, 177 ff., 246 f.
of Seneca, 174*b*
Mulvany (**C. M.**), note on Homer *Od.* (iv. 544 *sqq.*), 243 f.
notice of Molhuysen on the MSS. of the *Odyssey*, 273 ff.
notice of Zuretti's edd. of Homer *Il.* i. and *Od.* i., 220 f.
on Cyprian ϒ (='or'), 349*a*, *b*
on the fourth thesis of the Homeric hexameter, 151 f.
on the speech of Athene-Mentes (Homer *Od.* i. 253 *sqq.*), 290 ff.
munerarius, 85*a*
municipia and *coloniae*, 252*b*, 253*a*
Murray (**Augustus T.**), notice of Bruhn's *Iphigenie auf Tauris*, 212 ff.
Musonius Rufus, 130*b*
Mycenae, excavations at, 461*a*
Mycenaean sites and Egyptian pottery, 77*b*, 78*a*, 129*a*, *b*
Myres (**J. L.**), rejoinder to Torr's reply on notice of his *Memphis and Mycenae*, 128 ff.
'mystic'cults of Greece and the doctrine of an after-life, 262*b*, 263*a*
Mytilene, portrait coins of, 227*b*

N.

Nairn (**Ethel A.**), on Horace *Od.* (i. 28), 444 f.
Nairn (**J. A.**), notice of Kenyon's *editio princeps* of Bacchylides, 449 ff.
'name', words for, 14*b* (n.)
Narcissus, Housman's, rendered into Greek Elegiacs, 70*a*, *b*
nāu, *vām*)(*nas*, *vas*, 142*b*
Nazareth, inscribed bronze tablet at, 415*b*
ne, ironical use of in purpose-clauses, 346*a*, *b*
negatives in MSS., omission or insertion of, 337*a*
Nereid tomb, the, 224*a*
New College, Oxford, MS. in containing Cyprianic *notae* (?), 306*a*
Nicholson (**E. W. B.**), on a fragment of an earlier ed. of Apollonius' Homeric lexicon, 390 ff.
Nicole's *Le Laboureur de Ménandre*: fragments inédits sur papyrus d'Égypte &c., noticed, 453 ff.
nominative with infinitive, construction of the, 373 f., 380*a*, *b*
notae Tironianae, attributed to St. Cyprian, 306*a*, *b*
Novatian *de Trinitate*, suggested origin for, 369*b*
nucula, 85*a*
nugas (*nugax*), 84*b*
'numerus Taciteus', the, 329*b*
nummus (=*didrachmon*), 220*b*
numne, note on, 348 f.

O.

ὄαρ (*soror*, 'sister'), etymology of, 146 f.
Oaros, Persian forts on the, 279*b*, 282*a*
position of the, 280*a*, 282*b*
Obituary notices:—
George Martin Lane, 412 f.
Frederic de Forest Allen, 413 f.
oblique questions in retort, 344 f.
ὄβριμος or ὔμβριμος, etymology of, 89*a*, *b*
Oeconomicus and *Hellenics* (ii. 3, 31), on some passages of Xenophon's, 21 f.
Oinoanda, didrachm of in British Museum, 416*a*
oligarchies in Greece, 217*a*
omentum, *unguen*, 13*a*
Oordt's (van) *Plato and the Times he Lived in*, noticed, 116 f.
Opisthodomus on the Acropolis, the, 130*a*
opisthograph papyri, 454*a*
optimus maximus (Jupiter), 14*a*
o puerum pulchrum, 375*b*
orator ('petitioner', 'suppliant'), 351 f.
origin of money, the, 172 f.
of the Italians, the, 458*a*, *b*
os columnatum, 130*b*
οὐ μή, the construction of, 109 ff.
Ovid, Bentley and Heinsius on, 102*b*, 105 f., 426 ff.
edd. of, 102*a*, *b*
Heroides, critical notes on, 102 ff., 200 ff., 238 ff., 286 ff., 425 ff.
MSS. of, 102*b*
hyperbaton in, 428 f.
Owen (**S. G.**), notice of Postgate's ed. of Lucan, book vii., 167 ff.
on some passages in Juvenal *Satires* i. and iii., 399 ff.

P.

Paeanius, a new codex of (with new unedited fragments from the Greek transl. of Eutropius), 382 ff.
Page (**T. E.**), notice of Blass' edd. of the *Acts*, 317 ff.
Paktolos, supposed coins of, 322*b*
'palatals' and 'velars,' interchange of, 12*b*, 299*b*
Palatine, the Imperial Palace on the, 73*a*, *b*
Palestro (Piedmont), pre-Roman tomb at, 367*a*, *b*
Papyrus of Philo from Egypt, 67*a*
Papyri, Greek (Grenfell-Hunt's), 405 ff.
the Magical, 107 f.
the Rainer, 118*a*, *b*
paracenium, 441*b*
paradas (Ausonius), 261*b*
paratragoedia of comedy, the, 344*a*
parenthetic purpose-clause, ironical use of the, 346*a*, *b*
parentheticus, 441*b*
Paris MS. of Longinus *de Sublimitate*, 432*a*
MSS. of Pausanias, 123*a*
Parmenides and the 'Orphic' movement of the sixth century B.C., 409*a*
Diels' ed. of the fragmentary poem of, noticed, 409*a*, *b*
Parthenon, central group of E. frieze of the, 223*b*, 224*a*
position of the 'Victory,' 223*b*
sculptures of the, 70*b*, 71*a*
partial obliquity in questions of retort, 344 f.
Paros, fragment of the marble calendar at, 368*a*, *b*
Paschal Chronicler and Theophanes, the, 394*b*
ΠασιάδᾶϜο and ΤΛᾶσίᾶϜο, the genitives, 190 f. (see also 307*a*, *b*)
patiens (*impatiens*), 327*a*, *b*
Paton (**W. R.**), notice of von Arnim's ed. of Chrysostom, 362*a*, *b*
Pausanias, Hitzig-Bluemner's ed. of (book i., Attica), noticed, 123 f.
Paris MSS. of, 123*a*
Peiraeus, the Serangeion site at, 174*a*
perfect infinitive for present, 161*b*
perrogatio, 245*b*, 246*a*
Persian War relative to the date of Tyrtaeus, the, 10 ff. (see also 185 ff.)
personam aliquam agere, 326*b*
Petersen, von Domaszewski and Calderini's *Die Marcussäule*, noticed, 221 ff.

Petrus Monachus and Lucretius, 307*b*
Phalaecean verse, 149 f.
Phanes coin, the, 172*b*
Pharsalia of Lucan, Ridley's translation of the, noticed, 270 ff.
Pheidias' painting of the *clipeus* at Athens, 460*a* (n.)
Pheidon, coinage of, 172*a*, 173*a*, *b*
-φι case, the Homeric, 142*b*
Philadelphia, coins of, 322*b*
Philip and Alexander of Macedon, Hogarth's, noticed, 313 ff.
aims of, 314*b*
contrasted with Alexander, 315*a*
his fortification of Elatea, 315*b*
Philo and Longinus, resemblances between, 435 f.
citations and excerpts from, 67*b*
Cohn's ed. of (vol. i.), noticed, 66 f.
edd. of, 66*a*
MSS. of, 66 f.
old Armenian version of, 67*a*
papyrus of from Egypt, *ib.*
testimony of to the Septuagint text, 435*a*
Phocaea and Cyzicus, early coins of, 172*b*
Phrygia, Greek metrical inscriptions from, 31 f., 136 ff.
Phyrgio, 145*a*
Pigres and the *Batrachomachia*, 165*a*, *b*
Pindar, Christ's ed. of, noticed, 59 ff.
'echoes and responsions' in, 59*b*
optative without ἄν in, 60*a*
the nomic structure in, 59*b*
pinguis (*piger*), 298*a* (n.)
Pitigliano (Etruria), Etruscan *pagus* and cemetery at, 226*a*
Plato and the Times he Lived in, van Oordt's, noticed, 116 f.
Phaedo, possible divisions of, 62*b*
Philebus, date of, 227*a*
Rep. ix. (580 D) and iii. (390 A), emendations of, 349 f.
Symp. (179 C), note on, 159*a*, *b*
Plato's Dialogues, order of (based on 'stylometry'), 285*b*
von Arnim on the date of, 63*a*, *b*
philosophy and Socrates, 116*b*, 117*a*
quotations from Homer, 130*a*
Platt (Arthur), *Agamemnonca*, 94 ff.
notes on the newly-discovered fragment of Menander's Γεωργός, 418*b* (see also 453 ff.)
on some Homeric genitives, 255 ff.
on the fourth thesis of the Homeric hexameter, 152 ff.
rendering into Greek Elegiacs of Housman's *Narcissus*, 70*b*
Plautus *Bacchides*, McCosh's ed. of, noticed, 219 f.
cantica and scene-headings in, 250*b*
'Codex Turnebi,' discovery of a collation of the lost, 177 ff., 246 ff.
'Douaren,' readings of, 177 ff.
Epid. (19, 625), notes on, 106*a*, *b*
fragmentary MS. in the Monastery of Sainte Colombe, 177*a*
Gryphius ed. of in the Bodleian, 177 ff., 247*b*
its history, 179*a*, *b*
Most. (805 *sqq.*), note on, 160*a*, *b*
MSS. of, 177 ff., 246 f.
name of, 219 *b*
Truculentus, text of, 322*b*
Pliny's chapters on the history of art, 458 ff.
dates of great sculptors, 71*b*, 72*a*
Plutarch and Fronto, 305 f.
and Lucian, parallel between, 62*b*
and the decree of Aristides, 218*a*, *b*
and the *de Sublimitate*, 432*a*
Poems of Bacchylides, Kenyon's, noticed, 449 ff.
Poggio Sommavilla (Sabini), necropolis at, 276*b*
Polledrara bust, figures on the, 321*b*
Pollock (F.), *Fragmentum Cyclici Incerti*, 365*a*, *b*
Pompei, discoveries at, 367*b*
masons' marks in, 126 f.
plans of, 73*a*
Pondoland, ancient coins from, 365 ff.
Porcian coins and the Porcian laws, the, 437 ff.
portoria, 253ff.
Portus (Franciscus) on Longinus *de Sublimitate* (ix. 9), 431*b*, 434*a*
Poste (E.), criticisms on Jebb's ed. of Sophocles, 192 ff.
Postgate (J. P.), notice of Lindsay's *Introduction to Latin Textual Emendation*, 408*a*, *b*
notice of Ridley's transl. of Lucan's *Pharsalia*, 270 ff.
on some passages in Xenophon *Oecon.* and *Hellen.* (ii. 3, 31), 21 f.
Propertiana, 405*a*, *b*
Postgate's *M. Annaei Lucani De Bello Civili Liber* vii., noticed, 167 ff.
Silva Maniliana, noticed, 307 ff.
post tergum (*terga*), 206 f.
Priene, excavations at, 415*b*
pronouns and the dative of the possessor, 142 f.
Propertiana, 405*a*, *b*
Prose Dialogue, history of the, 61 f.
Prosopographia Imperii Romani Saec. I., II., III., Klebs-Dessau's, noticed, 457*a*, *b*
provocatio and the *iudicium populi*, 438*b* (n.)
and the leges Porciae, 438*b*, 440*b*
Ptolemaic coins from Pondoland, 366*a*
numismatics, the problem of, 48*b*
Ptolemy Auletes, debate on the restoration of, 108 f. (see also 244 ff.)
Philadelphus, Revenue Laws of, Grenfell's, noticed, 47 ff.
Publilius Volero, *appellatio* of, 440*b*
Purser (L. C.), note on Cicero *ad Att.* (v. 19, 2), 305*a*, *b*
notice of How-Leigh's *Roman History*, 409 f.
Pylos and Sphacteria, 1 ff., 155 ff.
Arnold's view on the topography, 7*b*, 8*a* (and n.)
Athenian defence N. of Pylos, 5 f., 157*b*
S., S.E. and S.W. of Pylos, 2 ff., 156 f.
blocking of the channels, 7 ff., 157 ff.
breadth of southern entrance to bay, 8 f., 155*a*
Burrows on, 1 ff.
Grundy on, 155 ff., 158 f.
incorrect length assigned to Sphacteria, 9 f., 159*b*
lagoon, 6 f., 157 *b*
last struggle on Sphacteria, 1 f., 155 f.
παλαιὸν ἔρυμα, 1 f., 156*a*
supposed remains on Hagio Nikolo, 2*a*, 156*a*
the attack on Koryphasion, 448*a*, *b*
Thucydides' mistake as to harbour and its channels, 6 ff., 159*b*
Pythion, the, 124*b*, 415*a*

Q.

quamvis, usage of, 174*a*
-que with 'vis adversativa,' 328*a*, *b*
Quelques Notes sur les Silvae de Stace, premier livre, Lafaye's, noticed, 43 ff.
-quens in *frequens*, 145*a*, *b*
queo, 145 f.
question of accentuation, a, 261*a*, *b*
quid ais?, 220*a*
quinque (O. Ir. *cóic*, Germ. *fünf*), 93*b*
quippe, 330*a*

R.

r and *l*, interchange of in Sanskrit, 299*b* (and n.)
Rainer papyri, the, 118*a*, *b*
Ramsay (**W. M.**), on a question of accentuation, 261*a*, *b*
ratio, 326*a*
Reggio, inscribed bronze stamp at, 226*b*
Reid (**J. S.**), note on Cicero *ad Fam.* (i. 2, 2 and i. 1, 2), 244 ff. (see also 108 f.)
notes on some passages in Cicero *ad Fam.*, 350 f.
notice of Buecheler-Reise's *Anthologia Latina*, 353 ff.
Reise-Buecheler's *Anthologia Latina*, noticed, *ib.*
Reiske on ἀμφότεροι (=ἑκάτεροι), 395*b*; (=πάντες), 393 ff.
relator, 246*a*
remigare, 329*a*
Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus, Grenfell's, noticed, 47 ff.
Rhodes, coins of Gorgus at, 276*a*
Richards (**Franklin T.**), notice of Hogarth's *Philip and Alexander of Macedon*, 313 ff.
notice of Klebs-Dessau's *Prosopographia Imperii Romani Sacc.* I., II., III., 457*a*, *b*
notice of two edd. of parts of Suetonius' *Lives*, 63 ff.
Richards (Herbert), critical notes on Xenophon's *Agesilaus*, 332 ff.
Constitutions, 133 ff., 229 ff.
De Re Equestri, 20 f.
Hiero, 17 ff.
Hipparchicus, 19 f.
Ways and Means, 418 ff.
Ridley's *The Pharsalia of Lucan*, translated into blank verse, noticed, 270 ff.
Roberts (**W. Rhys**), on the quotation from *Genesis* in the *de Sublimitate* (ix. 9), 431 ff.
Robson (**Ernest I.**), notes on Cicero *pro Sestio*, 303 f.
Roman antiquities (Thomas), 72 ff.
burial customs, 32 ff.
coins from Pondoland, 366*a*, *b*
Egypt economics, 407*a*
prosopographia, a, 457*a*, *b*
theatres, 174*b*
Rondissone (Piedmont), glass vessel at, 276*a*
ructus, *rumen*, 13*a*
Rutherford (**W. G.**), conjectures in the Text of the *Comici Graeci*, 16 f.

S.

Sabellus—(?) Sabine or Samnite, 339 f.
etymology of, 339*b* (n.)
testimony of Horace, 340*a*, *b*
of Juvenal, 340*b*
of Virgil, *ib.*
saepe, 144*b*, 145*a*
Sala, coins of, 322*b*
Sala Consilina (Lucania), geometrical vase at, 226*a*
Salamis, Corinthian inscription at, 174*a*
Salinon of Archimedes, the, 461*a*
salve (*salveto*), 85*b*
Sandys (**J.E.**), notice of Holmes' *Index Lysiacus*, 411*a*, *b*
Sanskrit dative, the, 142*a*, 373*b*
Sardis, bronze coin of, 322*b*
Schneider's *Das Alte Rom*, noticed, 126*a*, *b*
Schurzfleisch on Longinus *de Sublimitate* (ix. 9), 434*a*
scourging and the *dilectus*, 440*b*
and the lex Porcia, 437*b*, 438 ff.
Seaton (**R. C.**), on Aristotle *Poet.* (25, 6), 300 ff.
on the fourth thesis of the Homeric hexameter, 152*a*, *b*
Sebasteia on the Halys, coin of Valerian at, 227*a*
sequis (*saqina*), 298*a* (n.)
Sellers (**Eugénie**), notice of Bornecque's ed. of Cicero *de Signis*, 124 f.
Sellers and Jex-Blake's *The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art*, noticed, 458 ff.
Seneca, MSS. of, 174*b*
√*sep*, 293*a*
sepelio, 144*a*, *b*
scpio and *saepe*, 144*b*
and *sepulchrum*, *ib.*
septus, 145*a*
sermo plebeius in Horace, 358*a*
Servius on burial customs, 32*a*, *b*, 34*b*
sex, 146*b*
Seymour (**T. D.**), **Hale** (**W. G**) and **Wright** (**J. H.**), obituary notices of Professors Lane and Allen, 412 ff.
Shakespeare and Sophocles compared, 119 f.
and the 'Forensic Contest', 119*a*
his nearest approach to a Greek play, *ib.*
quoted or referred to, 94*a* (n.), 96*b* (n.), 119 f., 266*b*, 267*b*, 268*a* (and n.), 446*b*
Shelley quoted or referred to, 268*a*, *b*
Shuckburgh's *C. Suetoni Tranquilli Divus Augustus*, noticed, 63 f.
sic as a secondary predicate, 346 ff. (see also 27 f.)
volo (*iubeo*, *postulo*), 346*b*
Sicily, Freeman's, Lupus' transl. of, noticed, 362 f.
Sidgwick (**A.**), notice of Jebb's ed. of the *Ajax* 113 ff.
Sidon sarcophagi, the, 224*a*
signator, 399*a*
signum (*secare*), 298*a* (n.)
Silva Maniliana, Postgate's, noticed, 307 ff.
Simonides and the Alexandrine period, 170*b*
Epigrams, Hauvette on the authenticity of, noticed, 170 f.
problems preliminary to a criticism of, 170*a*
simpulus (*simpuvium*), etymology of, 147*a*, *b*
sister, 147*a*
Smilda's *C. Suetonii Tranquilli Vita Divi Claudii*, noticed, 64 f.
soccr (ἑκυρός), 146*b*
Socrates and the Platonic philosophy, 116*b*, 117*a*
somnia (=*nugae*), 85*a*
Sonnenschein (**E. A.**), on Sabellus—(?) Sabine or Samnite, 339 f.
Sophocles *Ajax*, Jebb's ed. of, noticed, 113 ff.
and Aeschylus, 113*a*
Cambridge representation of (1882), 113*b*
dénouement of, 113*a*, *b*
text of, 113*b*
and Euripides (*ap.* Aristotle), 300 ff.
and Shakespeare, 119 f.
Antigone (891—928), Campbell on, 456*a*
Goethe on, *ib.*
Kaibel's monograph on, noticed, 456*a*, *b*
criticisms on Jebb's ed. of, 192 ff.
Oed. Tyr., notes on, 199*a*, *b*
Trach. (781 *sq.*), note on, 259 f.
Souter (**A.**), on Greek metrical inscriptions from Phrygia, 31 f., 136 ff.
Spartan constitution, the, 217*a*, *b*
Spartans at Thermopylae, epigram on the, 171*a*
Spengel on Longinus *de Sublimitate* (ix. 9), 432 f.
S. Pietro Montagnon (Venetia), inscribed tombstone at, 226*a*
Stanley (**J.**), note on Lucretius (v. 436 *sqq.*), 27 f.
on *sic* as a secondary predicate, 346 ff. (see also above note)
Statius *Silvae*, edd. of, 44*a*, 46*a*
Madrid MS. of, 44*a*
pamphlets on by Lafaye and Klotz, noticed, 43 ff.

Stock (St. George), note on Eur. *Alc.* (320 *sqq.*), 107*a*, *b* (see also 304 f.)
Stratonicea, coins of, 276*a*
Strong (H. A.), notes on Ausonius, 260 f.
notes on Terence *Adelph.* (415 Dziatzko) and Plautus *Most.* (805 *sqq.*), 159 f.
'Stylometry,' Lutoslawski on, 284 ff.
subgrundarium, 33*a*, 35*b*
subicere ignem, 13*a*
Suetonius and Hadrian, 64*b*
Lives, two edd. of parts of, noticed, 63 ff.
sulcus, 401*a*
Summaries of Periodicals:—
American Journal of Philology, 174*a*, 322 f., 461 f.
Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik, 84 f.
Harvard Studies of Classical Philology, 130
Hermathena, 369*b*
Jahrbuch des deutschen archaeologischen Instituts, 83
Journal of Hellenic Studies, 321 f., 461*b*
Journal of Philology, 227, 461*a*
Mnemosyne, 368 f., 462
Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik, 84*a*, 175, 369*a*
Numismatic Chronicle, 83*b*, 416
Numismatische Zeitschrift [Vienna], 322*b*
Revue belge de Numismatique, 227*a*
Revue de Philologie, 174 f., 369
Revue Numismatique, 83*b*, 226*b*, 322*b*, 416*b*
Revue suisse de Numismatique, 83*b*, 322*b*, 416*b*
Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, 84*b*, 323
Zeitschrift für Numismatik [Berlin], 227
synchoregia at Athens, the, 174*a*
Syriac version of the *Apocalypse*, 369*b*
of the N.T. and the *Acts*, 318*a*

T.

Tacitus *Agricola*, (24), note on, 447*a*, *b*
notes on, 325 ff.
Taranto, find of silver vessels at, 82*b*
of silver vases at, 226*a*, *b*
Tegea, the heads from, 71*a*
Tell-el-Amarna, the finds at, 74 f., 128*b*, 225*b*
Tenedos, coins of with the double-axe representation, 227*a*, *b*
tenor, 325*a*, *b*
'tens' in composition, the, 93 f.
Terence *Adelph.* (223 *sq.*), note on, 352 f.
(415 Dziatzko), note on, 159 f.
tesquitum, 84*b*
testa (=*tête*), 261*b*
Théodule Pass (Matterjoch), coin-find on the, 416*a*, *b*
Theophanes and the Malalas Chronicle, 211 f.
Thera, the vases from, 78*a*
Thermae of Augustus at Bologna, site of the, 226*a*
'Thespiades,' the, 125*a*, *b*
Thii, Queen, 77*b*, 78*a*, 129*b*, 224*b*, 225*a*
Thomas (F. W.), some remarks on the accusative with infinitive, 373 ff.
Thomas' (Émile) *Rome et l'Empire aux deux premiers Siècles de notre Ère*, noticed, 72 ff.
Thomson quoted, 268*a*
Thucydides vi., notes on, 98 ff.
Thyateira, coins of, 416*b*
Tiberius Julius Alexander, edict of, 52*b*
Timgad (Algeria), French excavations at, 226*b*
ΤλᾶσίᾶFo and ΠασιάδᾶFo, the genitives, 190 f. (see also 307*a*, *b*)
topography and ancient history, 155*a*
Torr (Cecil), reply to notice of author's *Memphis and Mycenae* [see *Cl. Rev.* x. 477 ff.] 74 ff.
supplementary reply, 224 f.
Torr's *Memphis and Mycenae*, reviewer's rejoinder to author's reply, 128 ff.
Tortoreto (Picenum), coin-find at, 226*a*
terracottas at, 276*b*
'To the pure all things are pure,' classical illustrations of the adage, 449*a*, *b*
Traces of Epic Influence in the Tragedies of Aeschylus, Franklin's, noticed, 275*a*, *b*
tragic senarius λεκτικόν, the, 344*a*
Trajan and the *immunitas* to Brundisium, 254 f.
Trasimene (Lake), site of battle at, 227*b*, 461*a*
tributum, 251*b*
tributum soli, 253*a*
Trithemius and the *notae* of Cyprian, 306*a*, *b*
Tucker (T. G.), on a point of metre in Greek Tragedy, 341 ff.
on Aristophanes *Ran.* (1435 *sqq.*), 302 f.
on some passages of the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus, 403 ff.
Tunis (Susa), mosaic at, 83*a*
Twelve Tables and primitive burial, the, 33*a*, 34*a*, *b*
Tyndaris, excavations at, 82*b*
Tyrrell (R. Y.), notice of Christ's ed. of Pindar, 59 ff.
on the fourth thesis of the Homeric hexameter, 28*a*, *b*
Tyrtaeus, date and genuineness of his poems, 11 f., 185 ff.
date of and the Messenian War, 10 ff., 185 ff.
prior to the Persian War (?), 10 f., 187*a*, 189*a*, *b*
value of Lycurgus' testimony, 189 f.

U, V.

van Leeuwen: see Leeuwen (van)
van Oordt: see Oordt (van)
vanus, 298*a* (n.), *b*, 299*b*
Vaucher on Longinus *de Sublimitate* (ix. 9), 432*a*
√*veĝh-*, 13*b* (n.), 299*b* (n.)
vena (ὀχετός), 13*b*
veredos (Ausonius), 261*b*
Verrall (A. W.), notice of de Ridder's *De l'Idée de la Mort en Grèce à l'Époque classique*, 262 ff.
on the date of Tyrtaeus, 185 ff. (see also 10 ff. and *Cl. Rev.* x. 269 ff.)
vesanus, 13*a*
Vibius, 143*a*
vibrare, *ib.*
vicesima manumissionum (*libertatis*), 251*b*, 252*a*
vicī (*vicorum*), the forms, 142*b*
vicissim, etymology of, 144*a*
vĭcva ('all'), etymology of, 143 f.
Vienna Greek Papyri, the, 118*a*, *b*
Virgil and Homer contrasted, 268*b*
Bucolics, Cartault on, noticed, 269*a*, *b*
hyperbole in, 266 ff.
viride Appianum, 85*b*
vitricus, 94*a*
umor (ὑγρός), 13*a*
unedited fragments of Paeanius' transl. of Eutropius, 382 ff.
vocivus (*vacivus*), 15*b*
Voigt on primitive burial, 33*a*, 34*b*
vomer (ὀφνίς), 13*a*, 299*a*, *b* (and n.)
von Arnim: see Arnim (von)
von Domaszewski: see Domaszewski (von)
vowel-quantities before a mute+liquid or nasal, 341 ff.
√*us-*, 13*b*
ut, 'exclamatory-question' use of, 344 f.

W.

Walker (**E. M.**), notice of Greenidge's *Handbook of Greek Constitutional History*, 216 ff.
Walters (**H. B.**), Monthly Record, 82 f., 173 f., 226, 276, 367 f.
notice of de Ridder's *Early Greek Bronze Reliefs*, 321*a*, *b*
Watson (**E. W.**), on *notae Tironianae* attributed to St. Cyprian, 306*a*, *b*
Wattenbach's *Das Schriftwesen im Mittelalter*, noticed, 411 f.
Ways and Means of Xenophon, critical notes on the, 418 ff.
Webb (**Clement C. J.**), on Catulus of Parma, 282 f.
on Fronto and Plutarch, 305 f.
on some fragments of Macrobius' *Saturnalia*, 441*a*, *b*
Webb (**E. J.**), notice of Postgate's *Silva Maniliana*, 307 ff.
Wessely's *Corpus Papyrorum Raineri* (vol. i.), noticed by H., 118*a*, *b*
Wiesbaden, excavations at, 367*a*
Wolf (F. A) on Longinus *de Sublimitate* (ix. 9), 433*b*, 434*b*, 435*a*
Wordsworth quoted, 268*a*
Wright (**J. H.**), **Hale** (**W. G.**), and **Seymour** (**T. D.**), obituary notices of Professors Lane and Allen, 412 ff.
Wyse (**W.**), notice of Grenfell's *Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus*, 47 ff.

X.

Xenocrates (of Sicyon ?), in Pliny, 459*b*, 460*a*
Xenophon *Agesilaus*, authorship of, 336*a*, *b*
critical notes on, 332 ff.
hiatus in, 333*b*, 334*a*
similarity of style to Isocrates, 332*a*, 334*a*
Xenophon—*continued*.
Cynegeticus, date and style of, 84*b*
De Re Equestri, critical notes on, 20 f.
Hiero, critical notes on, 17 ff.
Hipparchicus, critical notes on, 19 f.
Memorabilia and Polycrates, 62*a*
suggested date of, 62*b*
Oeconomicus and *Hellenics* (ii. 3, 31), on some passages in, 21 f.
suggested date of, 62*b*
The Constitutions, critical notes on, 133 ff., 229 ff.
(α) *Resp. Ath.*, authorship of, 229*a*, 230*b*, 232 ff.
date of, 230 ff.
diction of, 229 ff.
hiatus, argument from, 231*b*
originally a dialogue (?), 233*b*, 234*a*
tone and spirit of, 234*a*, *b*
want of connexion in, 236*a*
(β) *Resp. Laced.*, authorship of, 133*a*, *b*, 136*a*, *b*
diction of, 134 ff.
hiatus, argument from, 136*a*, *b*
Ways and Means, authorship of, 418*a*, 421*a*
compounded of two speeches (?), 421*a*, *b*
critical notes on, 418 ff.
diction of, *ib.*
hiatus, argument from, 421*a*
Zurborg on, 421 ff.

Z.

Zurborg and the Πόροι of Xenophon, 421 ff.
Zuretti's *L'Iliade* (Libro Primo) and *L'Odissea* (Libro Primo), noticed, 220 f.

II.—INDEX LOCORUM.

Note.—References to the Orators are given by number of speech and section, to Aristotle by the paging of the Berlin edition, to Cicero by section, to Plato by Stephanus' paging, to Plautus and Terence by the continuous numeration where such exists. It will materially assist subsequent readers of the 'Review' if contributors will in future conform as far as possible to this system.

A.

Aelian :—
H. A. xvi. (32), 205*b*
Aeschines ii. (190), 58*b*
Ctes. (21), 140*a*
F. L. (41, 25), 140*b*
Tim. (6, 38 : 15, 25), 141*a*
Aeschylus :—
Ag. (**12**), 403*a* ; (36 *sqq.*), 214*b* ; (**69** *sqq.*), 293 ff. ; (78), 58*a* ; (**123**), 94 f. ; (**131**), 95*a*, *b*, 294*a* ; (**146, 149**), 95*b* ; (170–193), 95*a* ; (**192**), 95*b* ; (**218, 256, 259**), 56*b* ; (**386**), 58*a*, *b* ; (395), 449*a* ; (**504**), 58*b* ; (511 *sq.*), 265*a* ; (**525**), 403*a*, *b* ; (**552**), 58*a* ; (**560** *sqq.*), 403*b* ; (**563**), 57*b* ; (**587**), 56*b* ; (611), 135*b* ; (706), 453*b* ; (717), 449*a* ; (**718**), 56*b* ; (728), 429*a* ; (**735**), 448 f. ; (**757, 813**), 404*a* ; (**826**), 57*b* ; (**869**), 404*b* ; (**880**), 95*b*, 96*a* ; (**886**), 57*b* ; (**1025**), 96*a* ; (1056), 115*b* ; (1082), 97*b* ; (**1117**), 404*b* ; (1167), 95*a* ; (**1180**), 96*a* ; (**1234**), 58*b* ; (**1251**), 56*b*, 58*b* ; (**1277**), 404*b* ; (**1321**), 96*a*, *b* ; (**1451**), 58*b* ; (**1510**), 57*b* ; (**1536**), 96*b* ; (**1594** *sqq.*), 96 f. ; (**1605**), 58*b* ; (**1649**), 404*b*, 405*a* ; (**1657**), 405*b* ; (1664), 96*a*, 341*a* ; (1672 *sq.*), 96*a*
Cho. (**81, 100**), 57*b* ; (135), 59*a* ; (199), 379*a* ; (235, **281**), 58*b* ; (**318**), 56*a* ; (**338, 398, 422**), 57*b* ; (**427**), 56*b* ; (**447**), 57*b* ; (**477**), 59*a* ; (**480**), 58*b* ; (484 schol. on), 59*a* ; (**507, 548**), 58*b* ; (**611**), 57*b* ; (695), 58*b* ; (**745**), 57*b* ; (772), 58*b* ; (788), 58*a* ; (802), 56*b* ; (**804**), 57*a* ; (**821, 843**), 57*b* ; (925), 96*b* ; (**944**), 59*a* ; (**969**), 57*b* ; (**992**), 56*b* ; (**1020** *sqq.*), 57*a*, *b*
Eum. (11, **23**), 57*b* ; (**52**), 57*a* ; (**175**), 57*b* ; (**177**), 56*a* ; (238), 449*b* ; (**253, 266**), 57*b* ; (**277**), 56*a*, *b* ; (291), 59*b* ; (**313**, 317), 57*a* ; (**331**), 56*b* ; (**375**), 57*b* ; (**386**), 56*b* ; (431 *sq.*), 96*a* ; (451), 56*b* ; (**464**), 57*b* ; (466), 57*a* ; (**492**), 57*b* ; (**499**), 58*a* ; (**545, 553**), 56*b* ; (**565**), 57*b* ; (**591, 614**), 57*a* ; (**616**), 56*b* ; (**668**), 57*b* ; (**673**), 59*b* ; (**772**), 56*b* ; (805), 397*a* ; (**956**), 57*b* ; (960), 59*a*, (**987, 1032**), 57*b* ; (**1033**), 59*a* ; (1042), 59*b*
Aeschylus, *continued*—
Pers. (**217**), 58*b* ; (430), 57*b* ; (**528**), 193*a* ; (**740, 863**), 57*a* ; (**880**), 368*a* ; (938, **994**), 56*b* ; (999, 1034), 58*a*
Prom. (42, **51**), 57*a* ; (**116**), 57*b*, 213*b* ; (329), 449*b* ; (**358**), 98*a*, *b* ; (**424**), 57*a* ; (**473**), 57*b* ; (529, 540), 58*b* ; (**907** *sqq.*), 57*a*, 243*b* ; (918 *sqq.*), 242*a*
Suppl. (**14**), 57*b* ; (**59, 65**), 58*a* ; (122), 96*b* ; (265–285), 405*a* ; (**410**), 58*b* ; (**477**), 56*a* ; (**523**), 57*a* ; (625), 59*b* ; (**848**), 58*a* ; (**884**), 57*b* ; (**861, 870, 987, 1012**), 58*a*
Theb. (**84**), *ib.* ; (100), 96*b* ; (**229**), 57*b* ; (236 Verrall on), 109*b* ; (245), 57*a* ; (253), 375*a* ; (**263, 549**), 57*b* ; (**609**), 56*a* ; (**713**), 57*b* ; (**719**), 57*a* ; (**777**), 57*b* ; (809), 56*b* ; (**840, 894**), 57*b* : (**896**), 56*b* ; (**960=975, 976**), 58*a* ; (**1013**), 56*b*
fr. (291), 58*a*
Actna (327 Munro on), 169*b* ; (580), 290*b*
Afranius (29), 349*a* ; (92), 352*a*
Alciphron i. (38), 59*b* ; iii. (17), 418*a* (n.) ; (41), 59*a*
Alexis (257), 57*a* ; (Kock ii. p. 366), 16*a*
Ammianus xxix. (2, 15), 259*b*
Andocides :—
Myst. (140), 140*b*
Anthologia Latina (Buecheler and Reise)—(**11, 64** *sq.*), 353*b* ; (21, 110), 149*a* ; (**21, 204** : **210**), 353*b* ; (**63, 6** : **106, 1**), 355*a* ; (165, 3 : **197** : **198, 59** *sq.*), 354*a* ; (**207**), 355*a* ; (**276, 3** *sq.*), 354*a* ; (286, 297), 149*a* ; (**291, 7** *sq.*), 354*a*, *b* ; (**363**), 355*a* ; (**376, 7** *sq.*), 354*b* ; (442, 2), 150*b* ; (**479**), 355*a*, *b* ; (486, 60), 149*a* ; (489, 1 : 489, 4 : 489, 5 : 489, 6 : 489, 7 : 489, 47 : 716, 10), 149*b* ; (1109), 355*a*, *b* ; (1273 : 1362, 6 : **1409, 4** : **1552, 30**), 355*b*
Anth. Pal. ii. (15), 137*a* ; vi. (138), 170*b* ; viii. (389) 58*b* ; ix. (**335**), 100*a*, *b* ; xiii. (28), 171*a*
Apollonius Rhodius :—
Argonautica i. (636 schol. on), 369*b* : (1327), 57*b* ; iii. (**517**), 152*a*, *b* ; iv. (702), 297*a* : (**978**), 152*a*, *b*
Apost. Const. vii. (1), 147*b*
Appian :—
B. C. i. (**79**), 251 ff. ; iii. (10, 13), 109*b* ; v. (11), 402*a*

Apuleius :—
Met. i. (12), 306*b* ; ii. (3), *ib.*
Aratus :—
Phaen. (227), 137*a*
Aristias Trag. (3, 1), 58*b*
Aristides (541, 30 Dindorf=899 K., schol. on), 418*a*
Aristophanes :—
Ach. (55), 109*b* ; (172), 374*b* ; (803), 58*a*
Av. (136), *ib.* ; (274), 375*b* ; (651), 375*b* (n.) ; (811), 214*a* ; (**1269** *sq.*), 375*b* (and n.)
Eq. (1013), 92*b* ; (1146), 337*b* ; (**1385**), 19*a*
Lysistr. (136), 58*a* ; (720, 913), 415*a* ; (983, 1248 scholl. on), 16*b*
Nub. (**296**), 110*a* ; (**493** Blaydes on), 214*a* ; (**505**), 110*a* ; (508 scholl. on), 16*b* ; (**1316**), 57*b*
Pax (43, 46), 424*a* ; (121), 135*a* ; (332), 419*a* ; (**741** *sqq.*), 369*b* ; (1051), 337*b* ; (1076), 419*a* ; (1322), 235*b* ; (1328), 419*a*
Plut. (867), 231*b* ; (1022), 93*a* ; (1125), 231*b*
Ran. (34, **57**, 80, **103**, **108** *sqq.*), 356*b* ; (**168**), 356*b*, 357*a* ; (**169**, **170**, 190), 357*a* ; (**245**), 356*b* ; (259), 18*a* ; (**286**), 356*b* ; (301, **301***a*, **308**, **369**), 357*a* ; (477, **488**), 356*b* ; (**593**, **609**), 357*a* ; (**655**), 357*a*, *b* ; (**748**), 356*b* ; (**839**), 357*b* ; (**844**, **889**, **911**), 356*b* ; (990 Blaydes), 58*a* ; (1060), 356*b* ; (1102), 135*b* ; (**1119**), 357*b* ; (**1182**), 356*b* ; (**1435** *sqq.*), 302 f. ; (**1438**), 303*b* ; (**1448**), 356*b* ; (1454), 58*a*
Thesm. (289), 59*a* ; (485), 357*a* ; (780), 333*a* ; (822), 398*a*
Vesp. (159), 115*b* ; (176), 333*b* ; (177), 115*b* ; (277), 424*a* ; (1357), 356*b*
Aristotle :—
Ἀθ. πολ. (7, 1), 460*b* ; (7, 4), 235*b* ; (22, 4), 418*b* ; (**35**, **4**), 193*b*, 199*a*
De Anima (426*b* 19), 234*a*
Eth. Nic. (1099b 2), 136*a* ; (1099b 18), 424*b*
Hist. An. (8, 6, 2), 135*b* ; (544a 16 : 555b 30), 419*a*
Poet. (9), 301*b* ; (25 *init.*), 302*a* ; (**25**, **6**), 300 ff. ; (1459b 22), 424*a*
Pol. (1275b 10), 237*b* ; (1304 A), 218*a*
Rhet. (2, 8, 6 and 12 Cope on), 57*a* ; (2, 9, 1386b 28), 230*b* ; (2, 21), 197*a* ; (3, 9, 2), 459*a*
Aristoxenus (vol. ii. p. 23 § 55 C Westphal), 139*a*
Arnobius (2, 30), 354*a*
Asconius :—
In Cornel. (**p. 77**), 439*a*, *b*
Athanasius :—
De Incarn. (17 *sq.*=i. 126c, d, Migne), 449*a*
Athenaeus :—
Deipnosophistae (144 E), 17*a* ; (176 D), 226*a* ; (227 E), 336*a* ; (410 D), 16*a* ; (782 B), 460*a* (n.)
Augustine :—
Civ. Dei iii. (**27**), 42*b*, 185*b*
De Agone Christiano (§ 20=vi. 245a, ed. Bened.), 449*b*
Ausonius :—
Comm. Prof. i. 'Tib. Orat.' (17), 260*b* ; xxii. 'Vict. Subdoct.' (3), 261*a*
Epigr. xxxv. (9 *sq.*), 260*b* ; xl. (1, 3, 5), 261*b* ; lxxii. (2), *ib.*
Epitaph. Her. xv. 'Astyanacti' (1), 261*a*
Gratiarum Actio, 261*b*
Gregorio Epist., *ib.*
Idyll. iii. 'Villula' (25), 261*a* ; iv. (46), *ib.* ; xiii. (*ad fin.*), 261*b* ; xiv., 260*a*, *b* ; xv. (16), 261*b*
Lud. Sept. Sap. 'Ludius' (6), 261*a*
Monost. De Ord. XII. Imp. (12), *ib.*
Avianus :—
Fab. i. (16), 351*a*

B.

Bacchylides i. (**1–8**), 450*b* ; (**42** sq.), 451*a* ; ii. (**4** *sq.*, 8), *ib.* ; iii. (**21** *sq.*), 451*a*, *b* : (30 Kenyon's n. on), 450*b* : (**48**, 49, 60, **63–70**, **76** *sq.*, **88**, **90**), 451*b* ; iv. (**19**), 451*b*, 452*a* ; v. (5), 453*b* : (**26**), 452*a* : (52), 451*b* : (**67**, **80**, **107**), 452*a* : (109), 451*b* : (**151**), 451*b*, 452*a* : (182 *sqq.*), 453*a* : (**194**), 452*a* ; vi. (4 Kenyon's n. on), *ib.* : (5), 453*b* ; vii. (1, **7**), 452*a* : (9), 452*b* ; viii. (7, 10), 452*a* ; ix. (**10**), *ib.* : (**13**, **46**, **86**, **95** *sq.*), 452*b* ; x. (**1**, **10** *sq.*, 13), *ib.* : (15 Kenyon's n. on), 450*b* : (**45** *sqq.*), 452*b* ; xi. (**11**), 452*b*, 453*a* : (**52**), 453*a* : (62), 452*a* : (101), 453*a* : (120), 451*a* (n.) ; xiii. (3), 453*b* : (**50**), 453*a* : (62), 452*b* : (**126** *sqq.*, 129 *sq.*, **160**), 453*a* : (**166** *sqq.*), 451*b*, 453*a* ; (**189**, **190**, **195**, 197), 453*a* ; xiv. (22), *ib.* ; xv. (**5** *sq.*), 453*b* ; xvi. (31), 453*a* : (34), 453*b* ; xvii. (Kenyon's intr. n., 38), *ib.* : (86), 450*a* : (98), 451*a* : (102 *sq.* Kenyon's n. on, **112**, 124), 453*b* ; xix. (**15**, 25 Kenyon's n. on), *ib.*
fr. (**7**, **5** : 10 Bergk), *ib.* ; (66=40 Bergk), 452*a*
Basil. Hom. in S. Christi Generationem (ii. 602c, ed. Bened.), 449*a*

C.

Caesar :—
Bell. Afr. (80, 5), 207*b*
Bell. Civ. i. (6), 109*b* ; ii. (24, 2), 47*a* ; iii. (96), 327*a*
Bell. Gall. i. (9), 90*a* : (**40**, **14**), 84*a* ; vi. (44), 161*a*
Callimachus :—
Ep. (21), 58*b*
H. Del. (192), 58*a*
Carmina Epigraphica (Buecheler)—(29 : 81), 354*b* ; (461, 1 : 720, 12), 149*a*
Cassianus :—
Inst. xii. (28 pr.), 259*a*
Cato *ap.* Festus (p. 242 Müller), 146*a*
Monostich. (23 *P. L. M.* Baehr. iii. p. 237). 431*b*
R. R. (125), 400*a*
Catullus ii. (9), 150*a* ; v. (7), *ib.* ; xxvi. (1), *ib.* ; xl. (6), *ib.* ; xlii. (2, 3), *ib.* ; xliv. (21), 150*b* ; lviii. (1), 150*a* ; lxiv. (55), 240*a* : (**108** *sq.*), 175*a* ; xciii. (1), 430*b* ; xcvi. (**4**), 175*a*
Catulus Parmensis *ap.* John of Salisbury's *Policraticus* i. (4), 283*a* : (5), 283*a*, *b* : (13), 283*b*
Celsus i. (2), 400*a*, *b* ; iii. (8), 205*b*
Chionides :—
Πτωχοί (Kock **i. p. 5**), 16*a*
C. I. A. i. (381) 170*b* ; (**3961**, **2**), 305*b*
Cicero :—
Acad. i. (8 Reid on), 351*a* ; ii. (75 Reid on, 132), 351*b*
De Amicit. (ii. 36), 349*a* ; (25, 91), 327*a* ; (98), 12*a*
De Dom. (4, 8), 144*a* ; (5, 12), 24*a*
De Fin. ii. (8, 23), 400*a* ; iii. (23), 305*b* ; iv. (39), *ib.* : (63 Madvig on), 346*b*
De Legg. ii. (58), 33*a* ; iii. (**3**, **6**), 439*a*, *b*
De Nat. Deor. i. (31, 88), 348*b* ; ii. (58), 305*b* : (67), 15*a*
De Off. i. (27 *ad fin.*), 326*a* ; ii. (18), 305*b* : (21, 74 : 22, 76), 251*b* ; (**52**), 351*a*
De Orat. i. (**1**, **1**), 22*a* : (2, 7–9 : 3, 10), 23*a* : (**3**, **11**), 22 ff. : (**3**, **12**), 24*a* : (**4**, **13**), 24*a*, *b* : (**7**, **26** : **10**, **42**), 24*b* : (11, 45), 25*a* : (**13**, **55**), 24*b*, 25*a* : (**13**, **57**), 25*a*, *b* : (124), 400*a* ; ii. (**5**, **19** : **29**, **127**), 25*b* : (75, 305), 327*a* : (341), 351*a* ; iii. (46), 348*b* : (180), 205*a*
De Rep. ii. (**31**, **54**), 438 f.

Cicero—*continued.*
De Senect. (20, 77), 328*a*
Epp. ad Att. ii. (16), 251*b*, 253*b* : (22, 6), 350*a* ; iv. ((**5, 2**), 103*a* : (**17, 3**), 369*b* ; v. (**12, 2**), 84*a* : (**12, 3**), 305*b* : (**19, 2**), 305*a*, *b* ; vi. (1, 7), 112*a* ; vii. (2, 4), 305*a* : (**13, 3**), 305*b* ; xiii. (**22, 4**), 84*a* ; xiv. (12), 109*b* : (14, 5), 111*a* ; xv. (**20, 1**), 351*b* : (29, 2), 351*a* ; xvi. (1, 6), *ib.* : (2, 3), 351*b* : (7, 4), 351*a* : (14), 111*b*
Epp. ad Fam. i. (**1, 2**), 245 f. : (1, 3), 108*b*, 245*b* : (**2, 2**), 108 f., 244 ff. : (**7, 3**), 350*a* : (8, 4), 327*a* ; iii. (**4, 1**), 350*a* ; iv. (**15, 2**), *ib.* : v. (**20, 2**), 369*b* ; vi. (**6, 2**), 350*a* ; viii. (1, 21), 367*b* : (**3, 1**), 350*a*, *b* : (6), 142*b* : (**9, 1**), 350*b* : (**15, 4**), 350*b*, 351*a* : (**17, 2**), 351*a* ; ix. (**4**), 369*b* : (**16, 8**), 402*a* ; xii. (**4**), 109*b* ; xiii. (**29, 7**), 350*a* : (**69, 1**), 351*a*, *b* ; xv. (**2, 6**), 351*b* : (**18, 1**), 369*b* ; xvi. (**23, 1**), 351*b*
Epp. ad Q. F. i. (1, 11, 33), 253*b* : (1, 14), 327*a* : (**3**), 344*a*, 345*a* ; ii. (2, 3), 109*a*, 246*b* : (3), 111*b* : (4, 5), 109*a* : (**8 [10]**), 369*b* : (11, 4), 351*b* ; iii. (1, 11), 351*a* : (1, 14), 112*a*
Haruspicum Resp. (**39**), 369*b*
In Cat. i. (**9**), 344*a* : (13), 304*a*
In P. Clodium et Curionem (*fr.* **5, 1**), 84*a*
In Pis. (28), 304*a*
In Verr. i. (8, 21), 330*a* : (70), 346*b* ; ii. (1, 133), 169*b* ; iv. (16, 36), 112*a*, 125*b* : (54, 121), 112*b*, 125*b* ; v. (63), 439*b*
In Verr. de Signis (4), 125*a* ; (10 : 30), 125*b* ; (128), 125*a*
Phil. i. (7, 17), 111*a*, 125*b* : (13, 31), 111*b* ; ii. (14, 35), 111*a* : (34, 84), 351*b* : (37, 93), 111*b*, 251*b* ; v. (6, 15), 111*b* ; viii. (9, 26), *ib.* : (10), 109*b* ; ix. (1), *ib.* ; x. (17), 24*a*
Pro Arch. (**11**, 26), 330*a* (n.)
Pro Cluent. (41), 399*a* ; (59, 164), 430*b* ; (168), 400*a*
Pro Flacc. (32, 80), 251*b* ; (*ad fin.*), 261*b* (see 206*a*)
Pro Leg. Man. (**4, 10**), 25 f.
Pro Ligar. (8, 24), 327*a* ; (11), 261*a* (see 206*a*)
Pro Quinct. (97), 351*b*
Pro Rabir. (**3, 8 : 4, 12**), 438 ff.
Pro Rosc. Am. (44), 125*b* ; (**71**), 347*a*, 348*b* ; (84), 346*b*
Pro Sest. (**19**), 303*a b* ; (23), 304*a* ; (**24**), 303*b*, 304*a* ; (30), 304*a* ; (32), 351*b* ; (55), 27*b* ; (**72 : 82**), 304*a*, *b* ; (41, 88), 330*a* ; (110), 351*b* ; (**131**), 304*b*
Pro Tull. (20), 112*a*, 125*b*
Tusc. ii. (**42**), 344*a* ; iv. (45 : 55), 351*b* ; v. (23, 64), 144*b*, 444*b*
Cicero (Q.) :—
Ep. de Pet. Cons. (2, 9), 22*a*
C. I. L. vi. (2015), 65*a* ; xiv. (2485), 355*b*
Claudian :—
Bell. Goth. (25 *sq.*), 41*b*
Clement of Alexandria :—
Protrept. (p. 38), 443*a*
Strom. (pp. 108, 113, 159), 443*b* ; i. (316), 442*a* : (318), 442*b* : (323), 442*a* : (342), 443*b* : (367), 442*b* : (**426**), 444*a* ; ii. (23), 147*a* : (447), 442*b* : (**460**), 444*b* : (462 : 472), 442*b* : (570), 442*a* : iii. (540 : 553), 442*b* ; iv. (**566**), 443*a*, 444*b* : (570), 442*b* : (573), 442*a* : (574), 442*b*, 443*a* : (577 : 633), 443*b* ; v. (659), *ib.* : (660), 443*a* : (663 : 712), 444*a* ; vii. (841), 442*a* : (844), 443*a* : (878), 442*a* : (897), 443*a*
Cod. Just. (4, 61, 6), 254*a*
Comici Graeci : see 16 f.
Constantine Porphyrogennetos :—
De Adm. Imp. (c. 38, p. 171 ed. Bonn), 280*b* (n.)
Constantine Porphyrogennetos, *continued.*
De Ceremoniis (**p. 81, l. 19** ed. Bonn : p. 312 ll. 2, 4, 13 : p. 313 ll. 5, 13, 16), 394*b* : (p. 648, 16), 394*b*, 395*a* ; (**p. 656 ll. 12, 16, 18**), 395*a*
Corippus :—
Johannis iii. (229, 239 *sq.*), 206*b* ; iv. (178), *ib.* ; v. (12 *sq.*, 278), *ib.* ; vi. (439 *sqq.*), 207*a* : (462 *sq.*), 206*b*, 207*a* : (681 *sq.*, 758 *sq.*), 207*a* ; viii. (596), *ib.*
Cratinus :—
Ἀρχίλοχοι (Kock i. **pp. 11, 14**), 16*a*
Βουκόλοι (Kock i. **p. 18**), 16*b*
Δηλιάδες (Kock i. **pp. 19, 20**), *ib.*
Διονυσαλέξανδρος (Kock i. **p. 24**), *ib.*
Δραπέτιδες (Kock i. **p. 27**), *ib.* ; (**p. 30**), 16*b* 17*a*
Μαλακοί (Kock i. **p. 43**), 17*a*
Νόμοι (Kock i. **p. 52**), 17*b*
fr. (158), 230*b*
Curtius iii. (**1, 11**), 174*b* ; vi. (4, 3), 26*b* : (**4, 7**), 26*a*, *b* : (9, 1), 330*a* ; ix. (10, 25), 40*b*
Cyprian (**781, 18** ed. Hartel), 259*a*

D.

Demosthenes (7, 5), 141*a* ; (9, 17), 234*a* ; (21, 115), 265*a* ; (23, 30 : 45), 424*a* ; (23, 55), 139*a*, *b* ; (24, 98), 419*a* ; (29, 1), 333*a* ; (42, 20), 235*b* ; (52, 2), 140*b*
Callipp. (19), 395*b* (n.)
Macart. (1076 § 75), 291*b*
Phil. iii. (17), 21*a*, 138*a* ; iv. (60), 337*b* : (133) 174*b*
Didache i. (1), 147*a* : (2), 147*a*, *b* ; iii. (15), 147*a*
Digenes Akritas (Cod. Cryptoferr., ed. Legrand) i. (**205**), 395*b* ; ii. (**28, 244**), *ib.* ; iv. (**213**), *ib.*
Digest xlvii. (12, 3), 33*a* ; xlviii. (10, 1 § 4 : 12 : 13), 399*a* ; l. (15, 8 §§ 5, 7), 252*b*
Dio Cassius i. (58), 27*b* ; xxxvii. (20), 236*b* : (51), 253*b* ; lii. (6), 251*b* ; lx. (21, 2), 65*a* ; lxvi. (20), 331*b* ; lxxi. (8), 222*b* ; lxxviii. (22), 236*b*
Diodorus Siculus v. (56), 295*b* ; xxxv. (25), 410*a*
Diogenes Laertius ii. (6, 13), 232*b* ; iv. (15), 459*b* ; vi. (63), 449*a* ; ix. (**51**), 84*a*
Dionysius Halicarnasseus :—
De Din. Iudic. (1), 232*b*
Diphilus :—
Ἔμπορος (*ap.* Athen. 227 E), 336*a*

E.

Ecphantides (Kock i. **p. 9**), 16*a*
Ennius :—
Ann. (211), 352*b*
Etym. Magn. (498, 7 : 499, 43), 273*b*
Eupolis :—
fr. (43), 230*b*
Euripides :—
Alc. (29), 58*a* ; (64 *sqq.*), 242*a* ; (122), 275*b* ; (183 *sq.*), 267*b* ; (**320** *sqq.*), 107*a*, *b*, 304 f. ; (332 *sq.*), 242*a*, 243*a* ; (**333**), 242*a* ; (1158), 380*b*
Andr. (**169**), 462*b* ; (**1231**), 22*b*
Bacch. (**343**), 110*a*, 115*b* ; (663), 17*a* ; (**975**), 19*b*
Cycl. (149), 343*b* ; (**237**), 22*b* ; (245 *sqq.*), 97*a* ; (293), 58*b*
El. (22 *sqq.*), 59*a* ; (29), 265*b* ; (266), 59*a* ; (**629**), 341*a* ; (974), 58*b* ; (1245), 214*b* ; (1318), 56*b*
Her. (69 *sqq.*), 379*a* ; (392), 21*b*
Herc. Fur. (563), 216*a* ; (611 *sqq.*), 265*b* ; (1159), 216*a*

Euripides, *continued*—
Hippol. (**1228**), 134*b*
Ion (281 *sqq.*), 415*a*; (938), 173*b*
Iph. A. (1225), 59*a*
Iph. T. (8) 213*b*; (**13**), 212*b*; (21), 213*a*; (**31–41**), 213*a*, 214*a*, *b*; (52), 213*b*; (57), 214*a*; (59 *sq.*), 213*a*; (**62**), 212*b*; (**67**, **71**), 214*a*; (84), 213*b*; (**98** *sqq.*), 213*a*; (113), 212*b*; (157), 275*b*; (189 *sq.*), 212*b*; (221 *sqq.*), 214*a*, *b*; (243), 214*a*; (**259**), 213*a*, 214*a*; (288), 212*b*; (**292**), 213*a*; (294), 212*b*, 214*a*; (**295**), 213*b*; (336, 343), 212*b*; (350), 214*a*; (**351** *sqq.*), 213*b*, 214 f.; (**370**), 212*b*; (372, **376**), 213*b*; (**378**), 215*a*; (380 *sqq.*), 214*b*; (385 *sqq.*, 389), 214*a*; (432, 452 *sq.*, 455), 212*b*; (**477**), 213*a*; (**481**), 213*b*; (521), 212*b*; (556, **592**, **616**), 213*b*; (621 *sq.*), 214*b*; (633), 212*b*; (685), 213*b*; (720), 213*a*; (736), 213*b*; (782), 212*b*; (783), 214*a*; (836), 212*b*; (**895**, 898), 213*b*; (**905**, 912, 914), 212*b*; (940, **951**), 213*b*; (957), 213*a*, *b*; (977 *sqq.*), 58*b*; (1014), 213*a*; (**1023**), 213*b*; (**1025** *sq.*), 213*a*, 215 f.; (1071), 213*b*; (**1116**), 212*b*; (1118 *sqq.*), 215*a*; (**1134**), 212*b*, 213*b*; (1150 *sq.*, 1246, **1267**), 212*b*; (1345, **1349**), 213*a*; (1359), 216*b*; (1371), 212*b*; (1388), 213*b*; (**1394**), 213*a*; (1400), 216*b*; (1405), 213*a*; (1435), 214*b*; (1441b), 213*a*, *b*; (1468), 213*a*; (1469), 213*b*
Med. (67 *sqq.*), 283*b*; (509), 335*a*; (718, 789), 243*a*
Or. (14), 214*b*; (72, 196, 656), 59*a*; (961 *sq.*), 379*a*; (1049), 59*a*; (1105), 379*a*; (1527), 115*b*
Rhes. (211), 343*b*
Troad. (556), 57*b*; (1188), 265*b*
fr. (621), 56*b*; (904), 295*a*
Eusebius :—
Pr. Ev. (8), 107*a*

F.

Festus (p. 198 Müller), 352*b*; (p. 234 Müller), 440*a* (*s.v. Manes*), 13*b* (n.)
Frontinus (p. 35 Lachmann), 252*b*
Fronto (pp. 196, 204 Naber), 40*b*

G.

Gellius :—
Noct. Att. ii. (3, 5), 182*b*; iv. (14, 2), 438*b* (n.); xvi. (13), 252*b*

H.

Herodas i. (9), 58*a*: (**41**, **64**), 462*b*; v. (70), 59*a*
Herodian ii. (4, 7), 253*b*, 254*a*
Herodotus i. (65), 230*a*: (**86**), 174*b*, 369*b*: (**94**), 173*a*: (119), 97*a*: (**126**), 369*a*: (*ad fin.*), 453*a*; ii. (4), 79*b*: (17), 58*a*: (65), 237*a*: (106, 3), 423*b*; iv. (33), 16*b*: (104), 281*b*: (**135**), 381*b*: (185, 2), 423*b*; v. (20 *sq.*), 279*b*: (27 *ad fin.*), 279*a*: (48), 280*a*: (57 *sq.*), 279*b*: (99 *sqq.*), 280*a*: (124), 279*b* (n.): (136 *sqq.*), 282*a*; vi. (31, 3), 424*a*: (109), 218*b*, 219*a*; vii. (16), 335*a*: (46, 1), 337*b*: (191, 2), 21*b*; viii. (64), 259*b*: (70, 75 *sq.*), 258*b*: (79), 258*a*, *b*: (80), 259*a*: (81), 258*b*, 259*a*: (83), 258*b*, 259*b*: (84), 259*b*
Hesiod :—
Op. et D. (32, **33**, **372**, **455**), 397*b*; (**464**), 397*b*, 398*a*; (**467**), 398*a*; (**480**), 398*a*, *b*; (**531**), 398*b*; (**705**), 256*a* (n.); (721), 154*b*; (750), 398*a*; (**765** *sqq.*), 398*b*; (778), 154*b*
Scut. (**54**, **132**), 396*b*; (177), 394*a*; (**211**), 396*b*; (**252**), 396*b*, 397*a*; (256, 257, **288**), 397*a*; (**293** *sqq.*), 397*a*, *b*; (**296**), 397*a*; (395), 154*b*; (482), 397*a*
Theog. (287, 325, 339), 154*b*; (**340**), 30*a*, 154*b*; (**532**, **703**), 396*a*; (**706**), 396*a*, *b*; (**783**), 396*b*
fr. Rzach (25, 148, 155), 154*b*; (242), 95*b*
Homer :—
Batrachom. (**1**, **3**, **8**, **20**), 166*b*; (**23** *sq.*, **25**, **30**, **36**), 167*a*; (**42–52**), 167*a*, *b*; (65 *sq.*, 113 *sq.*, 184 *sq.*, 210 *sq.*), 167*b*
Epigr. xv. (Εἰρεσιώνη), 221*b*
Iliad i. (51), 392*a*: (78), 120*b*: (142), 121*a*: (171), 446*a*: (200), 142*a*: (233), 446*b*: (**418**), 243*a*: (462), 297*b*: (598), 445*b*; ii. (167), 274*a*: (190), 377*a*: (285), 15*a*: (291), 377*a*: (296 *sq.*, 298), 376*b*: (480), 122*a*: (**522**), 29*b*: (738), 392*a*: (**751**), 30*a*: (765), 143*b* (n.): (813, 842), 29*b*; iii. (98 *sq.*), 377*a*: (284 *sq.*), 375*a*: (295), 445*b*: (357 pap. ms.), 89*a*; iv. (281 *sq.*), 267*b*: (314), 293*a*: (**331**), 30*a*: (**387** *sqq.*), 242*b*, 243*a*: (453), 89*b*: (526), 446*a*; v. (302 *sqq.*), 266*a*: (361), 15*a*, 230*b*: (425), 447*a*: (525), 392*b*; (**706**), 30*a*: (807 *sq.*, 826 *sqq.*), 242*b*: (863), 243*a*: vi. (86 *sqq.*), 374*a*: (348), 377*b*: (500), 96*b*; vii. (141), 268*a*: (179), 375*a*: (**277**), 30*b*: (337), 152*b*: (**467**), 29*b*, 153*b* (n.); viii. (246), 377*a*: (308), 447*b*; ix. (14), 244*b*: (213), 97*b*: (225), 143*b* (n.): (240, 337 *sq.*), 377*a*: (499), 297*a*: (546), 243*a*: (573), 90*b*: (**603**), 293*a*; x. (292), 57*a*: (**364**), 30*b*: (389), 152*b*: (579), 446*a*; xi. (189), 29*b*, 154*a*: (239), 121*b*: (337), 143*b* (n.): (431 *sqq.*), 244*b*: (685 *sq.*), 377*a*: (796), 29*b*, 153*b*, 154*a*; xii. (3), 91*a*: (20), 29*b*, 154*a*: (55), 151*a*: (346 *sq.*, 359 *sq.*), 392*b*: (445 *sqq.*), 266*a*; xiii. (114, 172), 377*b*: (301), 392*a*: (339), 267*a*: (**346**), 30*b*: (352), 230*b*: (506), 30*a*: (**507** *sq.*), 445*a*, 446*a*, *b*; xiv. (129), 392*a*: (209), 397*b*: (342 *sq.*), 242*b*, 376*b*: (501), 374*a*: (**517**), 445*a*, 446*a*, *b*; xv. (56 *sqq.*), 377*a*: (189), 29*b*, 154*a*: (254), 242*b*: (583 *sqq.*), 102*b*: (690), 92*b*; xvi. (38), 29*b*, 153*b*, 154*a*: (99), 121*b*: (151), 166*b*: (230), 446*a*: (433 *sq.*), 377*a*: (**464**), 31*b*: (568), 168*a*; xvii. (190), 293*a*: (272), 376*b*: (**314** *sq.*), 445*a*, 446*b*: (**387**), 30*b*, 151*b*; xviii. (178 *sq.*), 367*b*: (243–313), 175*a*: (329), 376*a*: (**400**), 29*b*, 151*a*, 154*a*: (**583**), 30*b*; xix. (95–125), 239*a*: (284), 446*b*; xx. (**18**), 101*a*, *b*: (357), 392*a*; xxi. (126), 29*a*, 153*b*: (**177**), 166*b*: (**194**), 30*a*: (259), 392*a*: (**343**), 30*b*: (**602**), 29*b*; xxii. (**108** *sqq.*), 244*a*, *b*: (410), 349*b*: (433, 486), 31*b*; xxiii. (220), 446*a*: (246 *sq.*), 374*a*: (287–613), 103*a*: (579), 237*a*: (581 *sq.*), 398*a*: (**748**), 30*b*; xxiv. (121), 274*a*: (194 *sq.*), 377*a*: (323 schol. Ton), 275*a*: (595), 57*a*: (**616**), 30*a*
Odyssey i. (**93**), 274*a*: (94 schol. on), 291*a*: (97 *sqq.*), 274*a*: (117), 275*b*: (119 *sq.*), 376*a*: (170), 274*a*: (205), 122*a*: (**222**), 273*b*: (232), 122*a*: (249), 291*b*: (**253** *sqq.*), 290 ff.: (270), 290*a*: (272 *sqq.*), 291*b*; (**275–278**), 292 f.: (276), 292*b*, 293*b*: (277 *sq.*), 291*a*: (279 schol. on: 279–292), 292*a*: (293–302), 291*a*, *b*: (295), 291*a*: (296), 291 f.: (372 *sq.*, 374–380, 385), 291*a*: (393), 122*a*: (404), 31*a*: (437), 291*b*; ii. (4), *ib.*: (53), 292*b*, 293*b*: (**55**), 256*a*: (**57**), 30*b*, 31*a*: (**63**), 274*a*: (**77**), 121*b*: (131, 134), 292*a*: (141–145), 291*a*: (170, 182), 275*b*: (195 *sqq.*), 292*a*, *b*: (223), 292*a*: (235 *sq.*), 376*b*: (**325**), 31*a*: (349), 445*b*: (393), 292*a*; iii. (4), 293*b*: (24), 376*b*: (**27**), 120*b*: (106, 109), 274*a*: (151), 275*b*: (261), 14*b* (n.):

Homer, *continued*—
(349), 275*a*: (**372**), 274*b*: (382), 57*a*: (396), 292*a*; iv. (**72**), 274*b*: (86), 221*b*: (181), 95*a*: (187 *sqq.*), 103*a*: (226 *sq.*), 243*a*: (359), 446*a*: (409), 116*b*: (444), 31*b*: (**544** *sqq.*), 243 f.: (**547**), 273*a*: (**639**), 120*b*; (**646**), 30*b*: (**672**), 273*b*, 274*b*: (684, **733**, 739 *sqq.*), 122*a*; v. (119), 95*a*: (232), 275*a*: (351), 292*a*; vi. (93), 29*b*, 154*a*: (105 *sq.*), 266*a*: (168), 122*b*: (**245**), 120*b*: (**257**), 121*b*: (291), 275*b*; vii. (74), 275*b*: (**107**), 273*b*: (**114**), 29*b*, 153*b*: (285), 446*a*: (**301**), 256*a*: (311), 374*a*; viii. (106), 292*a*: (**208**), 121*b*; ix. (**8**), 349*b*: (51), 267*b*: (164, 204), 445*b*: (243, 262), 243*a*: (**330**), 120*b*: (360 *sqq.*), 392*a*: (**530**), 30*a*, *b*; x. (**66**), 122*a*: (100 *sq.*), 380*b*: (190), 122*a*: (287, **303**), 120*b*: (**393** *sq.*), 122*a*: (556), 90*b*; xi. (58), 57*a*: (75), 143*b*: (117), 292*a*: (196), 275*b*: (274 *sq.*), 122*a*: (338), 29*b*, 154*a*: (**484**), 30*a*: (629), 151*a*; xii. (**27**), 121*b*: (**52**), 122*b*: (**71**), 121*a*: (330), 392*a*; xiii. (**42**), 122*b*: (378), 292*a*; xiv. (33), 293*a*: (**95**), 446*a*: (**122**), 121*b*: (195), 293*a*: (**287**), 122*a*: (**295**), 30*b*: (326), 243*a*: (**381** *sq.*), 122*a*: (428), 275*a*: (**495** *sq.*), 122*a*; xv. (**16**), 291*b*, 293*b*: (18), 292*a*: (78), 31*b*: (**198, 227**), 122*a*: (268), 275*b*: (299 *sq.*), 122*a*: (367), 292*b*: (373), 122*a*; xvi. (23), 268*a*: (110), 446*a*: (**181**), 121*a*: (**244**), 122*b*: (**349**), 121*a*; (**423**), 122*a*; xvii. (41), 268*a*: (297), 120*b*: (**368**), 380*b*, 381*b*: (420), 122*a*: (**515**), 121*a*: (533), 122*a*: (**534**), 256*a*; xviii. (**8**), 29*b*: (106), 268*b*; xix. (**45**), 122*b*: (**67**), 273*a*: (**68**), 122*b*: (83), 275*a*: (157 *sq.*), 291*b*: (**232** *sqq.*), 243*b*: (295), 243*a*: (301), 101*b*: (388), 446*a*: (**449** *sq.*), 445*a*, 446*a*, *b*: (529) 292*a*: (540), 92*b*; xx. (14), 122*b*: (52 *sq.*), 377*a*: (**106**), 121*a*: (237), 293*a*: (**304**), 122*b*; xxi. (**202**), 293*a*: (**260**), 122*b*: (266), 122*a*: (**291**), 122*b*: (295), 171*b*: (**305**), 121*a*; xxii. (7), 122*b*: (**184**), 121*a*: (**304**), 267*a*: (**330**), 30*a*, 151*b*: (**380**), 122*b*: (**456**), 121*a*: (**499**), 122*b*; xxiii, (**52**), 121*a*, *b*: (136), 120*b*: (**175**), 122*b*: (211), 95*a*: (305), 445*b*: (599), 267*b*; xxiv: (**198**), 122*a*: (235 *sqq.*), 380*b*, 381*a*: (240), 151*a*, 152*b*: (**348**), 121*b*: (380), 374*b*: (488), 274*a*

Homeric Hymns vii. (**31**), 31*a*; xxviii. (10), 89*a*

Hymn to Aphrodite (213 *sqq.*), 381*a*

Hymn to Apollo (**53**), 165*a* (n.); (**228**), 166*b*

Hymn to Demeter (**12**), 165*a* (n.); (78), 396*a*; (99), 151*b*; (228 *sq.*), 398*a*; (**269**), 29*a*, 31*b*, 151*b*, 152*b*, 165*a* (n.); (455), 151*b*

Hymn to Hermes (**33**), 28*b*, 153*a*, 165*a* (n.); (77), 398*a*; (536 *sqq.*), 377*a*

Horace:—
A.P. (372), 379*a*

Ep. I. ii. (**5**), 103*b*: (48), 161*a*; v. (23), 159*a*; vi. (61), 400*a*; vii. (77), 340*b*: xiii. (14 Bentley on), 357*b*; xvi. (49), 340*a*; xvii. (38), 40*b*; II. i. (6), 39*a*: (25), 340*b*: (60). 359*a*; (**105**), 325*b*; ii. (209 Porphyrion on), 35*a*

Epod. ii. (41), 340*b*; vii. (19 *sq.*), 288*b*; xvii. (28), 340*a*, *b*

Od. I. i. (2), 268*a*; iii. (18), 329*b*; ix. (7), 340*b*; xx. (1), *ib.*; xxii. (9), *ib.*; xxviii. (**1–20**), 444*a*, *b*: (**3**), 445*b*: (**21–36**), 445*a*, *b*; II. xvii. (**25**), 175*a*; xviii. (14), 340*b*; III. i. (47), *ib.*; iv. (22), *ib.*; v. (9) *ib.*; vi. (33 *sqq.*), *ib.*: (38), 340*a*; xiii. (2), 38*b*; xxvii. (11), 206*b*; IV. iv. (24), 103*b*; viii. (**15** *sqq.*), 227*b*

Sat. I. i. (36), 358*b*; iv. (71), 359*a*: (105 *sqq.*), 159*a*: (129), 359*a*: (**135**), 348*a*; v., 358*b*: (49), 400*a*; vi. (**14**), 369*a*: (107 *sqq.*), 305*b*; viii. (**39**), *ib.*; ix. (29), 340*a*; x. (92), 242*a*; II. i. (34 *sqq.*), 340*a*; v. (102), 168*a*; vii. (118), 340*b*

Hyginus:—
Fab. (12: 13), 103*a*

I. J.

Jerome:—
Comm. in Ep. ad Galat. iii. 1 (col. 416 e Ven. ed. 1769), 206*a*

Ep. (82, 11 vol. i. col. 520 d, e), 206*b*; (120 ad Hedibiam c. 11=i. 845 c, d, ed. Ven. 1765, 4to), 449*b*

Prol. in Transl. Homil. xxxix. *Origen. in Lucam* (col. 245, 246), 206*a*

Inscr. Orell. (642: 1515), 147*b*

John of Salisbury:—
Policraticus i. (12, 13), 441*a*; viii. (7=Giles iv. p. 234, Migne *P.L.* cxcix. col. 731 D), *ib.*: (G. viii. p. 238, M. col. 734 C), 441*b*: (13), 306*a*: (19), 305*b*

Josephus:—
Ant. (*Prooem.*) 436*a*; xix. (228), 65*a*

Isaeus iii. (**50**), 141*b*

Isidore:—
Orig. xv. (11, 1), 32*b*

Isocrates:—
Ep. (**6, 9**), 334*b*

Iul. Capit. Maximin. (1 Salmasius on), 286*a*

Juvencus i. (352), 149*a*

Juvenal i. (12 Mayor on), 306*a*, *b*: (**64** *sqq.*), 399*a*, *b*: (**105**), 399*b*, 400*a*: (108), 399*b*: (**142** *sqq.*), 400*a*, *b*: (**155** *sqq.*), 400 f.; ii. (3), 261*b*; iii. (85), 340*b*: (124), 400*b*: (141), 399*b*: (169), 340*b*: (207), 261*a*: (213), 401*b*: (**216** *sqq.*) 401 ff.: (**226** *sq.*), 261*a*, 403*b*: (233), 400*b*: (239), 401*a*: (277), 403*b*: (296), 401*a*; iv. (19), 400*b*: (38), 261*a*: (90 *sqq.*), 27*b*; v. (56), 261*a*: (87), 401*a*: (132), 399*b*: (*subscriptio* to), 402*b*; vi. (203), 400*a*; vii. (134), 402*a*; ix. (129), 44*b*; x. (9), 260*b*: (66), 401*a*: (**82** *sqq.*), 26 f.: (146), 260*b*: (202), 400*b*: (225), 400*a*: (229), 340*b*: (274), 261*a*: (336), 399*a*; xi. (180), 261*a*: (206), 400*a*; xii. (121 *sqq.*), 400*b*: (129), 400*a*; xiii. (25), 400*b*; xiv. (105), 401*a*: (159), 400*a*: (173, 251), 400*b*; xv. (83), *ib.*: (170), 401*a*

L.

Laberius, Decimus (22), 349*a*, *b*

Lactantius:—
i. *Div.* (1, 4), 317*b*

Lampridius (pp. 381, 382 Baehr. *Frag.*), 150*b*

Lexiphanes *ap.* Lucian ii. (337), 59*a*

Libanius iv. (418, 9), 59*a*

Livy i. (15, 5), 352*b*; ii. (**10, 11**), 347*a*, 348*b*: (55), 440*b*; iv. (10, 9), 325*b*; vi. (12, 9), 168*a*: (34, 5), 346*a*; vii. (1, 7), *ib.*: (16, 7), 251*b*: (27, 1), 346*a*: (32, 16: 40, 9), 325*b*; viii. (1, 7), 339*b*: (4), 440*b*: (38, 11), 325*b*; ix. (10, 9), 161*a*; x. (1, 4: 6, 3), 346*a*: (**9**), 438 f.: (19, 20), 340*a*; xxi. (7, 8: 43, 17: 63, 13), 168*a*; xxii. (3, 12: 5, 7), *ib.*: (15, 1), 325*b*: (**50, 1**), 84*a*; xxvi. (21), 112*a*: (27, 2), 399*b*; xxx. (21), 112*a*; xxxi. (47), *ib.*; xxxii. (7), 253*a*; xxxiii. (24), 112*a*; xxxiv. (43), *ib.*; xxxv. (51, 3), 288*b*; xxxviii. (**21, 12**), 426*a*; xxxix. (4), 112*a*; xl. (12), 325*b*; xli. (17), 112*a*; xlv. (**28, 10**), 242*b*

Longinus :—
De Subl. iii. (5), 436*a* ; (viii. 1—ix. 4 : ix. 4—ix. 10), 432*a* ; ix. (2), 432*b* : (4 : 6 : 8), 433*a* : (**9**), 431 ff. : (10), 433*a* ; xii. (4), 436*b* ; xxii. (1), 435*b*, 436*a* ; xliv. (1), 435*b* (n.) : (3 : 4), 435*b* : (5), 436*a*
Lucan :—
Pharsalia i. (**16**), 38*b*, 184*a* : (26), 38*a* : (37), 43*a* : (54), 38*a* : (**101**), 37*b*, 181*b* : (**102**), 38*b*, 184*a*, *b* : (**103**), 37*b*, 43*a*, 181*b* : (**115** *sq.*), 38*b*, 39*a*, 184*b* : (**119**), 39*a*, 184*b* : (**120**), 37*b*, 181*b* : (126), 43*b* : (**128**), 184*a* : (**138** *sq.*), 39*a* : (160), 43*a* : (**186**), 39*a*, 184*b* : (187), 39*a* : (188), 38*a* : (209), 43*a* : (230), 206*b* : (**254**), 37*b*, 181*b* : (**260**), 39*a*, *b* : (**262** *sq.*), 39*b*, 184*b* : (282), 38*a* : (**291** *sqq.*), 39*b*, 184*b* : (299–351), 40*a* ; (305), 38*a* : (311), 43*b* : (315), 38*a* : (**316**), 39*b*, 185*a* : (320, 324 *sqq.*), 43*a* : (325 *sq.*, 327 *sqq.*, 331 *sq.*), 39*b* : (**333**), 39*b*, 40*a*, 185*a* : (334 *sq.*, **340**), 40*a* : (341), 38*a* : (**342**), 40*a* : (368), 43*b* : (**372**), 40*a*, 185*a* : (405), 37*b*, 38*a* : (**407** *sq.*), 40*a*, *b*, 185*a* : (414), 38*b* : (422), 40*b* : (423a, 424 *sq.*), 38*a* : (**426**), 40*b* : (426a), 38*a* : (429), 37*b*, 184*a* : (**432**), 40*b*, 185*a* : (**435**), 169*a* : (436 *sqq.*), 38*a* : (448), 37*b*, 181*a* : (**453** *sq.*), 38*a*, 41*a*, 43*a*, 184*a*, 257*a*, *b* : (**456**), 184*a* : (**461**), 41*a*, 183*b*, 184*a* : (**463**), 37*b*, 41*a*, 181*a* : (475), 38*a* : (**486** *sqq.*), 41*a*, 185*a* : (488), 43*b* : (491), 41*a* : (507), 38*a* : (511 *sqq.*), 41*a* : (520), 43*b* : (531), 43*a* : (534), 38*a* : (**536**), 41*a* : (**544**, **555**), 41*b*, 185*a* : (571), 43*b* : (**580**), 37*b*, 181*b* : (583, 587 *sq.*, 588, 589), 43*a* : (**600**), 41*b*, 185*a*, *b* : (**604**), 37*b*, 181*b* : (**607**), 41*b* : (614, 615, 620), 38*a* : (**630**), 41*b* : (**633**), 37*b*, 181*b* : (**637** *sq.*), 41*b* : (**642**), 37*b*, 181*b* : (643), 41*a* : (646), 43*a* : (648), 43*b* : (**656**), 41*b*, 42*a* : (667), 38*a* : (685), 43*b* : (687), 43*a*, 289*b* : (688, 695), 38*a* ; ii. (**51**), 169*a* : (65), 41*b* : (**128** *sq.*), 37*a* : (**140** *sqq.*), 42*b*, 185*b* : (**155**), 169*a* : (435 *sq.*), 38*b*, 184*b* : (437), 38*b* : (665), 39*b* : (730), 39*a* ; iii. (2), 39*b* : (**19**), 36*b*, 181*a* : (124 *sq.*), 288*b* : (125 *sq.*), 40*a* : (314 *sq.*), 288*b* : (620), 40*b* ; iv. (30), 40*b* : (704), 39*b*, 184*b* : (745), 39*a* ; v. (210), 40*b* : (351 *sq.*), 40*a* : (562), 401*a* ; vi. (313), 37*a* : (503), 40*b*, 185*a* : (828 Haskins on), 41*b* ; vii. (**27** *sqq.*), 168*a* : (90), 168*b* : (**93**), 168*a* : (**130**), 168*b* : (**140** *sq.*), 169*b*, 285*b* : (156), 169*b* : (**162**, **165**), 168*a* : (**179**), 168*b* : (**180**), 39*b*, 168*b*, 184*b* : (183), 39*b*, 184*b* : (257 *sq.*), 168*b*, 169*a* : (260 *sqq.*), 40*a* : (**262**), 168*b*, 169*a* : (**268**, **273**), 168*a* : (**286**), 169*a* : (**287**), 168*a* : (**303**), 169*a*, 403*a* : (**309**), 169*a* : (**320**), 168*a* : (**325**), 168*a*, *b* : (**334** *sq.*), 169*a* : (**395**, **414**), 168*b* : (**462**), 169*b* : (488–521), 168*b* : (**504** *sq.*, **522**), 169*a* : (**575**), 168*b* : (**587**), 169*a*, *b* : (**622**), 168*b* : (**625**), 169*b* : (**658**), 168*b* : (690), 40*b* : (712–724), 206*a* : (**735**), 169*b* : (**768**), 21*b* : (796), 168*b* ; viii. (**7**), 206 f. : (85), 39*b* : (664), 40*b* ; ix. (200), 19*a* : (985), 37*a* ; x. (182 *sq.*), 41*a* : (334), 288*b*
Lucian ii. (337), 59*a*
Lucretius i. (**554** *sq.*), 204*a*, *b* : (593), 103*b* ; ii. (**43**), 204*b* : (50), 104*b* : (382 *coll.* vi. 316), 13*b* : (**553**), 204*b*, 205*a* : (**1162**), 205*a* ; iii. (4 Munro on), 26*a* : (**58**, **75**, **82**, 97, 173, **194**, 198, 239, 240, 306, 319, **337**, **358**, **377**, **394**, 412, **415**, 420, **433**, **444**, **493**), 455*a* : (527), 456*b* : (531, **535**, **574**, **596**, 619, **658**, 685, **694**, **742**, 743, **747**, 806–818, 820), 455*a* : (894), 456*a* : (**917**, 962, **969**, **1019**), 455*a* : (1027), 104*b* : (1068 *sq.*), 289*a* ; iv. (488), 103*b* : (**633**, **638**,
Lucretius, *continued*—
896 *sq.*), 205*a* : (1026), 298*a* : (1078), 456*b* : (**1129** *sq.*), 205*a*, *b* ; v. (**311** *sq.*), 205*b* : (**396**), 205*b*, 353*b*, 354*a* : (409), 103*b* : (**436** *sqq.*), 27 f., 347*b* : (**881**), 205*b* : (970 Munro on), 347*b* : (**1442**), 205*b* ; vi. (52 Munro on), 401*a* : (80), 13*a* : (83), 130*b* : (309–316), 13*a* : (**357**), 307*a*, *b* : (1261 Munro on), 45*b*
Luxorius (Baehrens *P. L. M.* iv. 425), 400*a*
Lycophron (268), 401*a*
Lycurgus :—
C. Leocr. (**102–109**), 10*a*, 186 ff.
Lysias x. (28), 338*b*
Against Pancleon (6), 305*a*
Ἐπιτάφιος (74), 419*a*

M.

Macarius :—
Hom. (7 § 2 pr. = Migne *P.G.* xxxiv. 524d : 11 § 13 = M. 553d : 16 § 3 *sq.* = M. 616a, b), 449*a*
Macrobius :—
Sat. i. (24 § 17), 441*a* ; iii. (13), 441*b* : (17 §§ 1, 13), 441*a* ; vi. (9 Pontanus on), *ib.*
Manetho :—
Apotelesm. iii. (317), 137*a*
Manilius i. (**433** *sqq.*), 308*b*, 309*a* : (**469** *sqq.*), 310*a* : (503[505]), 41*a* : (547), 311*b* : (759), 310*b* : (**794** *sq.*), 289*b* : (**889** *sq.*), 309*b* ; ii. (**70** *sqq.*), 309*a*, *b*, 310*a* : (78), 309*a* : (**232**), 308*b* : (**426** *sq.*), 308*a* : (**533** *sqq.*), 310*a*, *b* : (658 *sq.*), 309*b* : (**889**), 313*b* : (**943** *sqq.*), 310*b*, 311*a* ; iii. (**545** *sqq.* Huet on), 311*b*, 312*a* : (**590–617**), 311*a* : (662), 309*b* ; iv. (**173**), 313*b* : (**204** *sq.*), 309*b*, 310*a* : (489), 308*b* : (**661**), 289*b* : (**817** *sqq.*), 312*a* : (**848** *sq.*), 312 *a*, *b* : (**860** *sqq.*), 312*b* ; v. (**338** *sqq.*), 312*b*, 313*a*
Martial :—
Epigr. i. (*praef.*), 351*a* : (117, 11 *sq.*), 359*a* ; ii. (**1**, **11** *sq.*), 28*a*, 347*a* : (4, 5), 149*b* : (6, 11), 150*b* : (**8**, **7**), 431*b* : (37, 1), 149*b* ; iii. (13), 400*b* : (73, 2), 150*a* : (76, 3), 148*b* ; iv. (30, 5), 150*a* : (44, 8), 355*b* ; v. (20, 9), 149*b*, 150*a* : (24, 15), 150*a* : (82, 3), 148*b* ; vi. (17, 3), 150*a* : (28, 8), 311*a* : (32, 1), 289*b* : (40, 3 : 60, 9), 148 *b* ; viii. (64, 17 : 76, 7), 150*a* ; ix. (46, 3 *sqq.*), 351*b* ; x. (49, 4 : 72, 4), 150*a* : (73, 9), 149*a* ; xi. (32, 1), 149*a* : (57, 4), 400*b* : (75, 2), 150*a* ; xii. (6, 11), 149*a* : (18, 4 : 34, 5 : 75, 4), 150*a* : (76, 2), 400*a* ; xiv. (194), 182*b*
Lib. Spect. xxiv. (3), 289*b*
Menander :—
Γεωργός P. 1*r.* (**l. 14**), 417*a*, 418*b* : (**l. 18**), 417*a* : (**l. 19**), 418*b*, 454*a* : (**l. 24**). 417*a* ; P. 2*v.* (**ll. 14**, **17**), *ib.* : (**ll. 19** *sqq.*), 417*a*, 418*b* ; P. 3*r.* (**l. 1**), 417*a*, *b* : (**ll. 3** *sq.*), 417*b*, 418*b* : (**ll. 10** *sqq.*), 417*b*, 418*a* : (**ll. 15**, **17** *sq.*), 418*a* : (**l. 19**), 418*b* ; P. 4*v.* (**ll. 4**, **12**, **14**, **16**), ib.
fr. (96 Kock), 454*a*, *b* ; (98 Kock), 454*a*
[See also pp. 453 ff.]
Mimnermus (**14**, **11**), 337*a*
Minucius Felix :—
Oct. (35, 1), 354*a*
Mnesimachus :—
fr. (4, v. 63 Kock ii.), 418*a*
Moschus :—
Idyll. i. (1, 3, 4, 6, 10, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28), 192*b*

N.

Nepos :—
Cimon (**4**, **2**), 368*a*
New Testament Writers :—
St. Matthew vii. (12), 147*a*, 148*a*, *b* ; xxii. (16), 317*a*
St. Mark i. (24), 360*b*
St. Luke v. (20), 360*b* ; vi. (4), 360*a* : (31), 147*a* ; vii. (48), 360*b* ; ix. (51), 319*b* ; xi. (4), 360*b* : xxiii. (12), 360*a*
Acts i. (**5** *coll.* **ii. 1**), 318*b*, 319*b* : (16-22), 318*a* ; v. (**32**), 319*b* : (**35**), 320*a* ; vi. (**8**, **10**), 319*b* ; vii. (**55**), 320*a* ; viii. (33), 318*a* : (**37**), 320*a* ; ix. (**5**), 319*b* : (**7**), 320*a* : (**20**), 319*b* : (**40**), 320*a*, *b* ; x. (**33**), 319*b* : (34-39), 317*b* : (**41**), 319*b* ; xi. (26 Blass on), 317*a*, *b* ; xii. (**13**), 319*b* ; xiii. (**32**), 320*a* ; xiv. (**9**), 319*b* : (**10**), 319*b*, 320*a* : (17), 361*b* ; xv. (**7**), 320*a* : (20), 147*b* : (**29**), 147*b*, 320*a* : (32), 320*a* ; xvi. (**4**), *ib.* : (37), 360*b* ; xviii. (**4**, **8**), 320*a* ; xix. (**4**), *ib.* : (**7**), 319*b* ; xx. (**1**), *ib.* : (**3**, **21**), 320*a* : (**28** Blass on, 32), 317*b* ; xxi. (**16**), 318*b*, 319*a* ; xxiii. (31), 319*a* ; xxiv. (5), 317*a* ; xxviii. (**14**, 16), 319*a*
1 *Corinthians* xi. (5), 361*a* ; xiii. (1 *sqq.*), 139*a*
Galatians ii. (18), 139*a*
Colossians i. (5), 138*a*
1 *Timothy* vi. (18), 361*b*
Revelation ii. (20), 360*b* ; xi. (9), *ib.*
Nonius (p. 125), 35*a*

O.

Old Testament Writers :—
Genesis i. (3 : 9 : 10), 433*a*
Apocrypha :—
Tobit iv. (15), 147*a*
Origen :—
C. Cels. vi. (73), 449*a*
Orosius :—
Hist. vii. (4, 10), 259*b*
Orpheus :—
Lith. (599), 95*b*
fr. (200 Abel), 97*b*
Ovid :—
Amor. i. (1, 6), 290*b* : (7, 66), 431*b* : (8, 109), 105*b* : (15, 31), 327*a* ; ii. (5, 23 *sq.*), 106*b* : (11, 5), 241*b* ; iii. (6, 40), 105*b* : (11, 50), 430*b*
Ars. Am. i. (197), 204*a* ; ii. (**676**), 429*a* : (**729**), 103*a* ; iii. (393), 202*a* : (811 *sq.*), 290*b*
Ex Pont. i. (1, 4), 351*b* ; ii. (**10**, **43**), 103*a* ; iii. (3, 51), 351*a* ; iv. (13, 19), 102*a* : (**16**, **33**), 84*a*
Fast. ii. (**500**), 287*a* ; iii. (**251**), 290*b* : (547 *sqq.*), 203*b* : (868), 241*b* ; iv. (597), 426*b* ; v. (245), 105*b* : (421), 13*a* : (429 *sqq.*), 33*a*, 35*a* : (660), 241*b* : (**670**), 288*b* ; vi. (158), 400*b* : (432), 103*b*
Her. i. (12), 104*b* : (**13-22**), 102 f. ; ii. (**17** *sqq.*), 201*b*, 202*a* : (51), 286*b*, 287*a* : (61), 240*b* : (65 *sq.*), 287*a* : (**105-118**), 103*b*, 104*a* : (**122**), 241*b* ; iii. (**19**), 428*a* : (50), 430*a* : (55 *sq.*), 428*b* ; iv. (45), 103*a* : (**111**), 431*a* : (132[a] *sq.*), 200*a* ; v. (7 *sq.*), 240*b* : (26), 200*a* : (**81-88**), 104*a*, *b* : (**121**), 105*b* ; vi. (10-14), 105*a* : (**25-40**), 104 f. : (54), 430*b* : (107 *sq.*), 105*b* : (**139** *sq.*), 431*b* ; vii. (22), 202*b* : (**23-26**), 200*a*, 202*a*, *b*, 288*a* : (29 *sq.*), 202*b* : (46), 241*b* : (55), 240*b* : (61 *sq.*), 202*b* : (**71**), 203*a* : (**73-78**), 202*b*, 203*a* : (**81-86**), 203*a* *b* : (85), 289*b* : (**97** *sqq.*), 201*a*, *b* :

Ovid, *continued*—
(**143** *sq.*), 428*a*, *b* : (170, 180 *sqq.*), 202*b* : (**191-196**), 203*b* ; viii. (**19** *sqq.*), 200*a*, *b* : (**33** *sq.*), 106*a*, *b* : (**43-50**), 203*b*, 204*a* : (**55-60**), 204*a*, *b* : (**69**), 103*b* ; ix. (7-10), 238*a*, *b* : (**43-46**), 238*b*, 239*a* : (82), 289*a* : (101 *sq.*), 239*a* : (**131-134**), 239*a*, *b* : (**153-158**), 239*b* ; x. (**29-32**), 239 f. : (43 *sqq.*), 240*a* : (46), 290*b* : (**67-75**), 240*b*, 241*a* : (**83-86**), 241*a*, *b* : (**110**), 428*b* : (126), 290*b* : (130), 287*a* : (**145** *sq.*), 241*b* ; xi. (**121-128**), 241 f. ; xii. (**62-66**), 286*a*, *b* : (75), 203*b* : (**84**), 286*b* : (**89-92**), 286*b*, 287*a* : (202), 426*b*, 427*a* ; xiii. (**29**), 105*a* : (**73** *sqq.*), 200*b*, 201*a*, 288*a* : (**122**), 242*b* ; xiv. (**53-66** *coll.* **111-116**), 287 f. : (**79-82**), 288*a*, *b* : (**101-108**), 288*b*, 289*a* : (103), 241*b* ; xv. (**39-44**), 289*a*, *b* : (**96**), 430*a* : (**103** *sq.*), 428*b* : (**129** *sq.*), 106*b* : (**139** *sq.*), 289*b* : (**197** *sq.*), 290*a* : (**201** *sq.*), 290*a*, *b* : (309), 149*a* ; xvi. (22), 241*b* : (**35-40**), 425 f. : (38-145), 426*a* : (**83** *sq.*), 426*a*, *b* : (**121-123**), 427*a* : (122, 132), 428*a* ; xvii. (14), 325*b* : (**51** *sq.*), 427*a* ; xviii. (11), 429*a* : (31 *sq.*), 240*a* : (**65** *sq.*), 427*a* : (**119-122**), 427*a*, *b* : (**187-194**), 427 f. ; xix. (**175-180**), 429*a*, *b* : (185 *sq.*), 427*b* ; xx. (**13-16**), 429*b* : (63 *sq.*), 428*a* : (**93** *sq.*), 429*a* : (**175-180**), 429*b*, 430*a* : (186), 430*a* : (**197** *sq.*), 430*a*, *b* : (233 *sq.*), 430*a* ; xxi. (**55-58**), 430*b* : (121), 428*a* : (**205** *sq.*), 431*a* : (**216**), 240*b* : (221 *sq.*), 426*b* : (**237** *sq.*), 431*a*
Ibis (622), 288*b*
Met. i. (**695** *sqq.*), 348*a* ; ii. (**278**), 369*b* ; iii. (644), 426*b* ; iv. (399), 21*b* : (433), 290*a* ; v. (**246**), 103*a* : (414), 426*b* ; vii. (67), 241*b* : (184), 290*a* ; viii. (142), 241*b* : (488), 201*b* ; ix. (131 *sq.*), 426*b* : (296, 308 *sq.*), 239*a* ; x. (132), 430*b* : (568 *sqq.*), 426*b* ; xi. (134 *sqq.*, 263), 426*b* ; (502 *sqq.*, 517), 268*a* : (749), 241*b* ; xiii. (349 *sq.*), 287*a* : (**896**), 348*a*
Rem. Am. (283, 481), 149*a*
Trist. i. (3, 11), 13*b*, 298*b* (n.) : (5, 34), 290*b* : (**9**, **33**), 103*a* : (**10**, **13**), 239*b* ; ii. (195), 149*a* : (245, 303), 351*a* ; iv. (4, 75), 149*a* : (10, 35), 168*b* ; v. (5, 21), 149*a* : (7, 27), 351*b*

P.

Pacuvius *ap.* Non. (i. 238), 459*a*
Paeanius Codex : see pp. 382-390.
Paulus *ap. Digest* l. (15, 8 §§ 5, 7), 252*b*
Epit. Festi (*s.v. matrem matutam*), 14*a*
Pausanias i. (**19**, **1** : 28, 11 : **29**, **2** : **29**, **7**), 124*a* ; v. (21, 15), 261*a*, *b* : (27, 3), 322*b* ; viii. (35, 8), 124*a* ; ix. (28 *sqq.*), 44*b* ; x. (19, 4), 448*b*
Persius (*Prol.* 3 Munro on), 347*b* ; ii. (35), 58*b* ; iii. (98 schol. on, Jahn), 400*a* ; vi. (32), 40*b*
Petronius (36), 323*b* ; (61), 130*b* ; (82), 402*a* ; (120, 62), 289*b* ; (126), 290*a*
Phaedrus :—
Fab. i. (**6**, **2**), 369*b* ; iv. (**9**, **2**), 174*b*, 175*a*
Philemon (28, 9), 56*a*
Philo :—
De Ebrietate (198 Cohn-Wendland vol. ii. p. 208), 435*b*
De Plant. ii. (p. 154), 295*b*
De Vita Mosis (Cohn-Wendland vol. iii. p. 678), 436*a*
Philostratus :—
Gymnast. (27), 59*a*
Imag. i. (16, 3), *ib.*
Vit. Apoll. vi. (40), 58*a* ; viii. (25), 59*a*
Vit. Soph. ii. (1, 5), 124*b*

Pindar :—
Isthm. i. (**25**), 61*b* : (**38**), 60*b* ; ii. (37), 58*b* ; v. (**36**), 60*b*, 61*a* ; vi. [vii.] (**33**), 60*a*
Nem. i. (**48**), *ib.* ; ii. (**15**), *ib.* ; iii. (**24, 33**), 60*b* ; iv. (**37**), *ib.* ; vii. (**34, 77**), *ib.* ; x. (**6, 61**), *ib.* : (72), 58*b*
Ol. vi. (**45, 72**), 60*a* ; vii. (89 *sq.*), 295*a* ; ix. (96), 195*b* : (156), 198*b*
Pyth. ii. (*Epode*), 364*b* ; iii. (67), 451*b* ; iv. (**118**), 60*a* ; vi. (**50**), *ib.* ; x. (**21**), *ib.* ; xi. (**58**), *ib.*
fr. (74 Boeckh, 84 Bergk), 32*a*
Plato :—
Alcib. I. (110 D), 141*a*
Ἀλκυών (iii.), *ib.*
Cratyl. (385 A, D, 386 A, 434 E), 139*b*
Crito (44 B), 111*b* ; (52 E), 235*b*
Euthyphro (3 E), 141*b*
Gorg. (469 D), 139*b* ; (525 E), 229*b*
Hipp. Mai. (300 D, 303 B), 139*b*
Iust. (374 E), 139*a*
Laws (719 D, 913 A), 139*b*
Meno (91 B), 424*b* ; (94 E), 141*a*
Parmenides (130 B), 117*a* ; (133 B), 141*a* ; (143 C), 140*a*
Phaedo (61 E), 141*a* ; (76 D), 117*a* ; (85 D), 337*b* ; (90 D), 22*a* ; (95 D), 380*b* ; (99 A), 140*a* ; (100 B), 117*a*
Phaedr. (**256 E**), 18*a*
Phil. (12 D), 110*b* (n.) ; (14 D), 139*b* ; (43 C), 424*a* ; (44 A), 230*b*
Protag. (316 C), 115*b*
Rep. (**390 A**), 349 f. ; (398 A), 221*a* ; (565 D), 97*b* ; (**580 D**), 349*a* ; (**586 B**), 462*b*
Symp. (**179 C**), 159*a*, *b*
Theaet. (142 B), 141*a* ; (152 A), 139*b* ; (155 B, C, 159 B), 140*a* ; (159 C), 139*b*, 140*a* ; (160 A, C), 139*b* ; (175 C), 21*a* ; (175 E), 135*b* ; (191 B), 139*b* ; (192 B *sqq.*), 140*a* ; (192 D–193 E), 139*b* .
Plautus :—
Amph. (*Prol.* 34), 352*a* ; (**117**), 347*a* ; (**342**), 180*a* ; (702 Leo on), 250*a*
Aul. (**159**), 84*a* ; (508, 521), 145*a*
Bacch. (**36, 602**), 180*a* ; (651), 249*b* ; (**887**), 180*a* ; (**893**), 84*b* ; (**1005**), 347*a*
Capt. (**139, 208**), 345*a*, *b*
Cas. (59), 106*a* ; (**704** *sqq.*), 347*a*
Cist. (678), 248*a*
Curc. (**317**), 96*a*
Epid. (**19**), 106*a*, *b* ; (20), 106*b* ; (**498**), 408*b* ; (**625**), 106*b*
Men. (**75, 391**), 180*a* ; (**681** *sqq.*), 345*a*
Mil. Gl. (**24**), 408*b* ; (211), 130*b* ; (**254**), 84*b* ; (594), 145*a* ; (**854**), 347*a* ; (**888**), 84*b*
Most. (**182** *sq.*, **556**), 345*a* ; (**765**), 85*a* ; (**805** *sqq.*), 160*a*, *b* ; (811, 814), 160*b* ; (**1017**), 345*b*
Pers. (**35, 52**), 248*a* ; (**131**), 345*b* ; (**205**), 178*a*, *b*, 248*a* ; (**239**), 178*b*, 248*a* ; (**587**), 177*b* ; (**623**), 248*a*, 249*a* ; (**705**), 177*b* ; (**762**), 178*a* ; (**843**), 178*b* ; (**856** *sq.*), 248*a*
Poen. (**63**), 179*a* ; (**266**), 249*b* ; (357), 352*b* ; (**384**), 178*b*, 179*a* ; (**471**), 180*b* ; (**504, 586**), 249*b* ; (**718** *sq.*), 179*a* ; (**770**), 177*b* ; (**926**), 250*b* ; (**977**), 178*b*, 180*b*, 247*a*, *b* ; (**1019**), 178*a* ; (**1033**), 178*b*, 247*b* ; (**1036, 1075, 1168**), 250*a* ; (**1204**), 178*b* ; (**1237**), 250*a* ; (**1355**), 177*b*, 178*b*, 180*b*
Pseud. (**389**), 347*a* ; (519), 375*b* ; (**738**), 178*b* ; (785), 84*b* ; (**1051**), 180*a* (n.) ; (**1272** *sqq.*), 249*b*
Rud. (**166**), 178*a*, 248*a* ; (**185** *sqq.*), 248*a*, *b* ; (**311** *sqq.*), 178*a*, 248*b* ; (**417**), 178*a*, *b* ; (**418**), 178*b* ; (**457, 481**), 248*b* ; (**519**), 178*a* ; (**545**), 103*a* ; (**613**), 178*b* ; (**647** *sqq.*), 248*b* ; (**664** *sqq.*), 248*b*, 249*a* ; (**686**), 178*a*, 249*a* ; (**687, 697** *sqq.*), 249*a* ; (**712** *sq.*), 249*b* ; (**724**), 178*b* ; (**727**), 249*b* ; (**738**), 178*a* ; (**745**), 250*a* ; (1127), 345*b* ; (**1169**), 369*b* ; (1380), 249*b*
Stich. (494 *sq.*), 352*b*
Trin. (288), 374*b* ; (**378**), 345*b* ; (826), 13*a*
Trucul. (**546**), 348*b* ; (**900**), 203*a*
Pliny :—
Hist. Nat. iii. (12, 107), 340*a*, *b* ; xv, (**7, 30**), 52*b* ; xviii. (24), 351*a* ; xxv. (23, 56), 169*b* ; xxix. (1, 8, 28 D.), 327*a* ; xxxiii. (56), 251*b* : (156), 459*a* (n.) ; xxxiv. (40–93), 112*b* : (54), 125*b* : (66), 459*a* (n.) : (69), 125*b* : (**71**), 459*a* : (83), 459*b* ; xxxv. (68), *ib.* : (126 : 153), 459*a* (n.) ; xxxvi. (11–39), 112*b* : (**25**), 458*b*, 459*a* : (32), 367*b* : (39), 125*a*
Pliny :—
Paneg. (33, 3), 401*a* ; (91, 6), 325*b*
Plutarch :—
Aem. Paul. (38), 251*b*
Ages. (18), 337*b*
Brut. (13), 59*a*
De Curios. (vol. viii. p. 60 R), 253*b*
Lycurg. (26), 237*b*
Mor. (405 C), 59*a* ; (578 B), 295*b* (n.) ; (672 C), 295*a* ; (1137 D), 443*a*
Per. (36), 315*b*
Phoc. (**5**), 369*a*
Pomp. (51), 245*a*
Quaest. Graec. (3), 297*b* ; (31), 294*b*
Pollux x. (170), 124*a*
Polybius vi. (14), 438*b* (n.) ; viii. (30), 34*b* ; ix. (12 *sqq.*), 175*b*
Pomponius Mela i. (1), 41*a*
Porphyrius :—
De Abstin. (2, 17), 294*b* ; (2, 28), 295*a*
Priapea (77, 8[B.]), 150*b*
Proclus :—
Hymns vii. (11 *sqq.*), 97*b* (n.)
Propertius I. xvi. (29), 327*a* ; xix. (13), 290*b* ; II. i. (13), 238*b* ; v. (**3** *sq.*), 405*a* ; viii. (**15** *sqq.*, **17** *sqq.*), 348*a* ; xv. (5), 238*b* ; xviii. (**29** *sq.*), 289*b*, 430*a* ; xxvii. (7 Postgate on), 329*b* ; III. iii. (31), 290*b* ; xxii. (**21** *sq.*), 405*a* ; xxiii. (23 *sq.*), 242*a* ; IV. ii. (**35** *sqq.*), 405*b* ; iii. (53), 290*a* ; V. v. (19), 355*a*
Prudentius :—
C. Symm. i. (322), 349*b* ; ii. (246 *sq.*), 45*b* : (940), 349*b*
Ham. (871), *ib.*
Peristeph. vi. (155), 150*b*

Q.

Quintilian :—
Inst. Orat. ii. (**21, 20**), 348*b* ; iii. (1, 17), 436*a* (n.) ; viii. (3. 34), 85*a* ; xi. (3, 119), 44*a*
Quintus Smyrnaeus ii. (206), 154*b* ; x. (73), *ib.* ; xii. (65, 314), *ib.* ; xiv. (443), *ib.*

S.

Sallust :—
Cat. (2, 7), 423*a* ; (**7**), 348*a* ; (16, 2), 399*b* ; (**51, 21, 40**), 438*b*
Seneca :—
De Ira iii. (3, 6), 401*a* : (12), 440*a*
Epp. (89, 22), 400*a* ; (91), 323*b* ; (94, 30), 327*a* ; (95, 43), 400*b* ; (113, 1), 402*a*
Herc. Oet. (**496**), 103*a* ; (**1799**), 439*a*
Phoen. (277 *sq.*), 288*b*
Suas. ii. (19), 351*a*

Seneca, *continued*—
Thy. (94 *sq.*), 288*b*; **(416)**, 103*a*; (760 *sqq.*, 770, 1042 *sq.*, 1063 *sqq.*), 97*a*
Sidonius Apollinaris vii. (412), 258*b*
Silius Italicus :—
Punic. iv. (15), 41*b*; v. (391), 40*b*; viii. (363), 41*b*: (430), 40*b*; x. (202), 289*b*; xi. (288), 40*b*; (395), 290*b*; xiii. (395), 201*b*; xiv. (311), 42*a*; xv. (143), 40*b*; xvii. (98, 101, 103), 42*a*
Simonides :—
Epigr. (Nos. 3, 5, 47, 62 [101 Bergk], 63 Hauvette), 171*b*; (83 Hauvette), 171*a*; (188 Bergk), 170*b*
Simplicius :—
Comm. on Arist. *Phys.* (**p. 160, v.**), 369*a*
Sophocles :—
Ai. (**51**), 198*a*; (**75**), 111*b*, 115*a*, *b*; (**186**), 424*a*; (**311**), 115*b*; (**330**), 198*a*, *b*; (**405**), 113*b*; (**475** *sq.*), 115*a*, 198*b*; (**521**), 115*b*; (554), 113*b*; (560 *sqq.*), 242*a*; (571), 113*b*; (**573**), 115*b*; (**601**), 114*a*; (630), 58*a*; (**635**), 198*b*; (646–692, **651**), 115*a*; (693), 268*a*; (**799**), 114*b*; (802 Lobeck on), 58*b*; (**839** *sqq.*), 114*a*, *b*; (**869**), 113*b*, 114*a*; (896), 268*b*; (**966**), 115 f.; (**1030**), 114*a*, *b*; (**1082**), 115*b*; (1192), 424*b*; (1201), 58*b*; (**1281**), 114*a*; (**1282**), 198*b*, 199*a*; (**1344**), 115*b*; (1417), 113*b*
Ant. (259 *sq.*), 379*a*; (**289**), 195*b*; (**296**), 141*b*; (**361**), 195*b*; (**368**), 196*a*; (441), 375*b*; (666), 115*b*; (**673**), 141*b*; (891–928, 904 Kaibel on), 456*a*; (1006), 295*b*; (**1023**), 196*a*; (**1209**), 196*a*, *b*; (1307), 268*a*
El. (**24**), 196*b*; (**133**), 115*b*; (164, 187), 59*a*; (442 Jebb on), 115*b*; (**466**), 196*b*, 197*a*; (**489, 567**), 197*a*; (**743**), 197*a*, *b*; (961 *sqq.*), 59*a*; (**1113**), 197*b*; (1224), 268*a*; (**1246**), 198*a*; (1409, 1428), 369*a*
O. C. (**62**), 194*a*; (100 schol. on), 295*a* (n.); (**761**), 194*a*; (**787**), 194*b*; (806), 194*a*; (**1153**), 194*b*, 195*a*; (**1220**), 195*a*, *b*; (**1452**), 195*b*
O. T. (**15**), 368*a*; (**44** *sq.*), 192 f.; (**226** *sqq.*), 193*b*, 199*a*; (272 schol. on), 58*b*; (315), 115*b*; (**324, 328**), 199*a*; (**501**), 199*a*, *b*; (519), 56*a*; (569), 199*a*; (**673, 681**), 193*b*; (**715** *sqq.*), 199*b*; (**766**), 339*b*; (**800**), 199*b*; (979), 115*b*; (1032), 199*b*; (1182), 424*a*; (**1349**), 194*a*
Phil. (**615** *sqq.*), 380*b*, 381*a*
Trach. (**781** *sq.*), 259 f.
Statius :—
Achill. i. (443), 205*b*; ii. (21), 41*b*, 185*a*
Silv. I. i. (2), 44*b*: (**27** *sq.*), 46*b*, 47*a*: (**37**), 44*a*, *b*: (95 *sq.*), 290*b*; ii. (**4** *sqq.*), 44*b*: (69 *sq.*), 290*b*: (**235** *sq.*), 45*b*; iii. (**32**), 44*b*; iv. (**7** *sq.*), 44*b*, 45*a*: (**62**), 45*b*: (**102**, 123 *sq.*), 45*a*: (125), 46*a*; v. (**27**), 45*a*: (**36** *sqq.*), 45*b*; vi. (**15**), 45*a*: (34, **37** *sqq.*), 46*a*; II. i. (160), 45*a*; ii. (80), 46*a*: (**107** *sq.*), 46*a*, *b*: (**133** *sqq.*), 46*b*; iii. (73), 46*a*; III. iii. (94), 45*a*; iv. (103 *sqq.*), 46*b*; IV. iii. (150), 46*a*; V. iii. (**169** *sqq.*), 47*a*, *b*: (258), 44*b*
Theb. ii. (134), 46*a*: (**311**), 103*a*; iii. (229), 45*b*: (**443**), 205*b*: (582 *sqq.*), 258*b*; v. (157), 45*b*: (751 *sq.* Lactantius on), 46*a*; x. (297), 290*b*
Stobaeus :—
Flor. (5, 67: 40, 8), 234*a*; (57, 5), 417*b*, 454*b*
Strabo i. (3, 19), 44*b*; vii. (3, 13), 281*a* (n.); (pp. 360, 487), 451*a*
Suetonius :—
Aug. (8), 109*b*; (15), 64*a*; (33), 399*a*; **(43)**, 64*b*; (52: 101), 64*a*
Suetonius, *continued*—
Cacs. (43), 253*b*
Claud. (**4: 10**), 65*b*; (**14: 15**), 65*a*; (**16: 20: 45: 46**), 65*b*
De Rhet. (1), 254*b*
Nero (9), 65*b*; (37), 400*b*; (49), 439*a*
Tib. (57), 435*a* (n.); (61), 27*a*; (75), 375*b*

T.

Tacitus :—
Agr. (2), 331*a*; (**4**), 325*a*, 331*b*; (**6**), 325*a*, *b*, 326*a*, 331*b*; (7), 331*a*, *b*; (**8**), 326*a*, *b*; (**9**), 326*b*, 331*a*; (**11**), 326*b*, 327*a*; (**12**), 327*a*, *b*; (13 *ad fin.*), 327*b*; (14), 328*a*, 331*a*; (15), 331*a*; (**17**), 327*a*, *b*, 328*a*, *b*, 447*b*; (19), 326*b*, 328*b*; (22: 23), 331*a*; (**24**), 326*a*, 328*b*, 447*a*; (25), 326*a*; (**28**), 326*a*, 328*b*, 329*a*; (30), 331*a*; (33), 326*b*, 327*a*; (**34**), 329*a*, *b*; (**38**), 326*a*, 329*b*, 447*b*; (42), 327*a*, 331*a*; (**43**), 329*b*, 330*a*; (**44**). 330 f.; (**45**), 331*b*, 332*a*; (**46**), 332*b*
Ann. i. (4), 326*b*: (25), 327*b*: (27), 379*a*: (**34**), 348*a*, *b*: (42), 326*b* (n.): (43), 326*b*: (**64**), 84*a*; iii. (18), 328*a*: (20), 326*a* (n.): (35), 328*b*: (42), 328*a*: (54), 326*a*; iv. (4 *ad fin.*: 29 *od fin.*), 328*b*: (38), 326*b*: (**40, 4**), 348*a*, *b*; xi. (35), 328*b*; xii. (14: 19), *ib.*: (53, 5), 399*b*; xiii. (10), 328*b*: (14: 46), 326*b*: (50), 253*b*, 255*a*: (51), 251*b*; xiv. (7), 326*b*: (10), 328*b*: (27), 252*b*: (**51**), 369*b*; xv. (**17, 3**), 348*a*, *b*. (44 Nipperdey on), 401*a*; xvi. (6), 326*a* (n.): (19), 328*b*: (28), 326*b*
Dial. (1), 331*a*; (7 Gudeman on), 325*b* (n.); (**16**), 369*b*; (34), 327*a*; (36), 325*b* (n.); (37 Gudeman on), 327*a*, *b* (n.)
Germ. (2), 14*a*; (5), 327*a*; (7), 326*a*; (11), 327*a*; (14), 326*b*; (28), 331*a*; (30), 327*b*; (33), 326*a*; (37), 326*b*; (41), 331*a*; (43), 328*b*; (44), 327*b*; (46), 331*a*
Hist. i. (15: 30), 326*b*: (36), 327*b*: (50), 328*a*: (84), 326*b*; ii. (83), *ib.*: (96), 328*b*; iv. (1), 327*b*: (2), 326*b*: (47), 326*a* (n.): (50), 332*a*: (83, 84), 378*b*
Teles :—
περὶ αὐταρκείας *ap.* Stob. *Flor.* (5, 67), 234*a*
περὶ φυγῆς *ap.* Stob. *Flor.* (40, 8), *ib.*
Terence :—
Adelph. (**223** *sq.*), 352 f.; (237 *sq.*), 375*a*; (**415**), 159 f.; (425), 160*a*; (428), 159*a*
Eun. (160), 28*a*, 347*a*; (293), 352*a*; (391), 12*a*; (**588**), 174*b*
Heaut. (11, 12, 15, 26), 352*a*; (521), 92*b*
Hec. (9), 351*b*, 352*a*; (**283** *sqq.*), 347*a*; (612), 345*b*
Phorm. (**210** *sqq.*), 27*b*, 346*a*, *b*
Terentianus Maurus (2548 K.), 150*b*
Tertullian :—
Apol. (3), 317*a*, *b*
De Idolatr. (2), 125*b*
Theocritus :—
Idyll. v. (18), 59*b*; vi. (13), 447*a*; xiii. (71), 446*b*; xxv. (6), 450*b*
Theophanes (**p. 26 l. 12** ed. de Boor), 395*b*; (**p. 111, 17** ed. de Boor=**172** ed. Bonn: **p. 184=284**), 394*b*; (**p. 238, 9=368**), 393*a*, *b*; (**p. 465, 15=720: p. 471=730**), 394*a*; (**p. 469=725**), 394*a*, *b*
Theophanes Contin. (p. 467 ed. Bonn), 394*b*
Theophilus :—
Ad Autol. (vi. 34), 147*b*
Thucydides i. (6, 2), 230*a*: (**17**), 98*b*: (25, 4), 21*a*: (69, 1: 89, 4), 338*a*: (103), 116*b*: (122, 2), 20*b*: (126 *ad fin.*), 140*a*: (138, 4), 335*a*; ii. (15), 124*b*: (**38, 4**), 369*a*: (41, 4), 338*b*: (52), 309*b*: (70, 3),

Thucydides, *continued*—
98*a*: (77), 449*b*: (93), 110*b*; iii. (28), 378*a*: (37, 3), 230*a*: (**45, 3**), 462*b*: (47, 4), 337*b*: (57), 58*b*: (**59, 2**), 462*b*; (82, 15), 230*a*; iv. (8, 5–7), 7*b*: (9, 1), 157*a*: (9, 2)) 3*b*, 4*b*, 5*a*, 156*b*: (10, 3), 214*b*: (13, 1), 4*b*, 448*a*: (13, 3), 9*b*, 158*a*, *b*: (13, 4: 14, 1), 7*b*: (23), 448*a*: (31, 1), 7*b*: (35, 4), 1*b* (n.); v. (81, 2), 419*a*: (90: 108), 99*b*; vi. (**20**), 98*a*, *b*: (21, 2), 100*b*: (**23, 1**), 100*a*, *b*: (**36, 1: 37, 1**), 368*b*: (**37, 2**), 368*b*, 369*a*, 462*b*: (39, 2), 229*b*: (46, 2), 100*b*: (**69, 1**), 99*b*: (75), 363*b*: (87, 4: **87, 5**), 100*b*: (**89, 6**), 98 f.: (92), 99*b*; vii. (12, 1), 140*b*: (57, 3, 4), 98*a*: (85, 4), 140*b*; viii. (1, 1), 335*a*: (47), 229*b*: (47, 2), 140*b*: (**58**), 378*a*, 379*b*, 381*b*
Tibullus i. (5, 14), 202*a*: (6, 45), 289*b*; iv. (1, 129), 290*a*

U, V.

Valerius Flaccus:—
Argonautica vii. (572), 42*a*
Valerius Maximus iv. (3, 8), 251*b*
Varro:—
Ling. Lat. vi. (13), 352*b*
Rer. Rust. ii. (2, 1), 205*a*
Sat. Menipp. (17 Bücheler), 340*b*
Velleius Paterculus ii. (6), 253*b*: (11: 24), 328*a*: (60), 109*b*
Vergil:—
Aen. i. (37), 345*b*: (214, 235), 41*b*: (498 *sqq.*), 266*a*: (588), 27*b* (n.); ii. (19 Servius on), 205*a*: (**117**), 175*b*; (619), 168*a*: (697), 401*a*; iii. (564 *sq.*), 268*a*: (567), 266*b*; iv. (20), 199*b*: (**39** *sqq.*), 84*b*: (436), 268*b*; v. (64 Servius on), 32*a*: (80 *sq.*), 201*b*: (527), 401*a*: (**620** *sqq.*), 27*b*, 347*b*: (695 *sq.*), 268*a*; vi. (152 Servius on), 32*a*: (**222** *sq.* Conington on), 379*a*: (256), 297*b*: (305 *sqq.*), 267*b*: (402), 47*b*: (454), 240*a*: (**607**), 462*b*: (**860** *sqq.*), 347*b*, 348*a*; vii. (52), 47*b*: (178), 340*b*: (308), 338*a*: (528 *sqq.*), 268*a*: (665, 706, 709), 340*b*; viii. (291 *sqq.*), 239*a*: (510, 635), 340*b*; ix. (414), 268*b*: (706), 13*b* (n.); x. (38), *ib.*: (177), 13*b*: (270), 142*b*: (318), 268*a*: (396), 168*a*; xi. (100 Servius on), 352*b*: (413), 268*b*; xii. (**45**), 240*b*: (727), 168*a*: (899 *sq.*), 266*a*
Catal. xi. (15 *sq.*), 46*b*
Copa (**34**), 103*a*
Ecl. i. (11 *sq.*), 267*b*: (35), 142*a*: (38 *sq.*), 268*b*: (**65**), 269*b*; v. (65), 375*b*; ix. (**46** *sqq.*), 269*a*, *b*: x. (**68**), 103*a*
Georg. i. (314), 267*a*; ii. (167 Conington and Philargyrius on), 340*b*: (172), 268*b*: (324, 336 *sqq.*, 364), 268*a*: (532), 340*b*; iii. (**92**), 28*a*, 347*a*, *b*: (255), 340*b*: (541 *sqq.*), 266*a*; iv. (282), 41*b*: (**455**), 240*b*
Moret. (36, 60, 75, **99**), 368*a*
Vitruvius:—
De Architectura i. (**11**), 369*a*; xii. (Praef. 16), *ib.*
Vitruvius Rufus (**39**), 174*a*, *b*

X.

Xenophon:—
Ages. (1, 1), 334*b*; (**1, 2**), 336*b*; (**1, 3**), 335*b*, 336*b*; (1, 4), 334*b*, 335*b*, 336*a*; (1, 5), 334*b*; (**1, 6**), 334*b*, 336*b*, 337*a*; (1, 7), 338*b*; (**1, 8**), 334*b*, 337*a*; (1, 9), 337*a*; (1, 13), 334*b*, 335*a*; (1, 17), 420*a*; (1, 18), 334*b*, 336*a*, 419*b*; (1, 19), 334*b*; (**1, 20**), 334*b*, 337*a*; (1, 21), 337*a*; (1, 22), 334*b*; (1, 23), 334*b*, 335*a*; (1, 24), 334*b*, 335*a*, *b*; (1, 26), 334*b*;
Xenophon, *continued*—
(**1, 27**), 337*a*; (**1, 28**), 334*b*, 337*a*, 422*a*; (**1, 31: 1, 32**), 337*b*; (1, 34), 335*a*; (**1, 37**), 335*a*, 337*b*; (1, 38), 335*a*, *b*; (**2, 1**), 334*b*, 335*a*, 337*b*; (**2, 2**), 335*b*, 337*b*; (2, 3), 335*b*; (2, 6), 334*b*, 335*a*; (**2, 7**), 334*b*, 335*a*, 336*a*, 337*a*, *b*; (**2, 8**), 334*b*, 337*b*; (2, 9), 335*a*; (2, 11), 335*b*; (**2, 13**), 335*a*, *b*, 337*b*; (2, 14), 335*a*, *b*, 419*a*; (2, 18: 2, 19), 335*a*; (2, 20), 419*a*; (2, 21), 335*a*; (2, 22), 334*b*, 335*a*; (2, 23: 2, 24: 2, 28), 335*a*; (2, 31), 334*b*, 336*a*; (3, 1), 334*a*, 335*b*; (3, 2), 332*b*; (3, 3), 332*b*, 335*a*, 336*a*; (3, 4), 333*a*; (4, 1), 335*b*; (**4, 3**), 333*a*, 335*a*, 338*a*; (4, 5), 332*b*, 336*a*; (4, 6), 332*b*, 334*b*, 420*a*; (5, 1), 333*a*; (5, 3), 332*b*, 333*a*; (5, 4), 333*a*, 335*b*; (5, 7), 332*b*, 333*a*; (6, 1), 336*a*, 338*b*; (6, 2), 332*b*, 333*a*, 338*a*, *b*; (6 3), 332*b*, 338*a*; (6, 4), 333*a*; (6, 5), 333*a*, 336*a*; (6, 6), 333*b*, 335*b*; (**6, 7**), 333*b*, 338*a*; (6, 8), 333*b*, 334*b*, 335*b*; (7, 2), 332*b*, 333*b*, 335*b*; (7, 3), 333*b*; (7, 4: **7, 6**), 338*a*; (**7, 7**), 333*b*, 334*b*, 336*a*, 338*a*; (**8, 1**), 333*b*, 335*b*, 338*a*; (8, 2), 333*b*; (8, 3), 333*a*, *b*; (8, 4), 337*a*; (8, 5), 336*a*; (8, 6), 337*a*; (8, 7), 333*a*, 338*b*; (**8, 8**), 338*a*, *b*; (**9, 1**), 333*a*, 338*b*; (9, 2), 335*b*; (**9, 3**), 333*b*, 335*b*, 338*b*; (**9, 4**), 332*b*, 333*a*, *b*, 338*b*; (9, 6), 333*b*; (9, 7), 19*b*, 333*b*; (10, 1), 332*b*, 333*b*; (**10, 3**), 338*b*, 420*b*; (10, 4), 333*b*, 336*a*, 420*b*; (11, 2), 419*a*; (11, 3), 419*b*; (11, 4: 11, 5), 334*a*, 335*b*; (11, 6), 334*a*; (11, 7), 334*a*, 338*b*; (**11, 8**), 334*a*, 339*a*; (11, 9), 334*a*, 335*b*; (11, 10), 338*a*; (11, 11: 11, 12), 334*a*, 335*b*; (11, 13), 335*b*; (**11, 14**), 334*a*, 339*a*, *b*; (**11, 15**), 334*a*, 335*b*, 336*a*, 339*b*; (11, 16), 334*a*
Anab. i. (1, 8), 419*a*: (2, 9), 369*a*: (8, 11), 134*a*: (8, 20), 141*a*: (10, 17), 335*a*; ii. (4, 1), 420*a*: (6, 18), 333*a*; iii. (1, 7), 236*b*: (2, 16), 419*b*; iv. (5, 9), 135*b*: (5, 13), 419*a*; vi. (1, 1), 134*b*: (2, 15), 236*b*: (4, 4), 141*a*: (5, 13), 135*a*: (6, 24), 380*b*: (6, 38), 332*b*; vii. (6, 23), 22*a*: (7, 17), 336*a*: (7, 25), 334*b*, 419*b*.
Apol. Socr. (29), 19*b*.
Cyneg. (5, 14: 5, 17: 5, 19: 6, 19), 94*a*: (9, 10), 94*a* (n.); (**10, 7**), 59*a*; (13, 9), 424*b*.
Cyrop. i. (2, 11), 420*a*: (4, 18), 134*b*: (5, 12), 135*a*: (6, 2), 59*b*: (6, 3), 141*a*: (6, 26), 420*a*: (6, 40), 22*a*; ii. (3, 3), 135*b*: (3, 7), 229*b*: (**4, 27**), 134*b*; iii. (1, 15), 333*a*: (1, 36), 335*b*: (3, 31), 59*b*; iv. (2, 21: 2, 39), 333*a*: (2, 44), 334*b*: (5, 28), 333*b*; v. (2, 12), 420*a*: (3, 40), 141*b*: (4, 39), 335*a*: (5, 21), 420*b*; vi. (**1, 36**), 18*a*, *b*: (1, 41: 2, 30), 420*a*: (3, 13), 333*b*: (3, 35), 336*a*: (4, 1), 337*b*: (4, 15), 335*a*; vii. (2, 20), 141*b*; viii. (1, 32), 333*a*: (2, 5), 141*a*: (2, 28: 3, 1), 336*a*: (3, 3: 3, 25), 135*b*: (5, 15), 420*a*: (7, 13), 333*a*, 419*b*: (7, 14), 419*b*: (7, 15), 334*b*: (7, 22), 334*a*: (8, 9), 419*a*.
De Re Eq. (**1, 1**), 20*a*; (**1, 2**), 20*b*; (**1, 3**), 20*b*, 237*a*; (**1, 17: 2, 1: 4, 4: 5, 10: 6, 3**), 20*b*; (**6, 14**), 21*a*, *b*; (**7, 2**), 21*b*; (7, 11), 419*a*; (**8, 1**), 21*b*; (8, 12), 134*b*; (**10, 15: 12, 6**), 21*b*
De Vectig. (1, 1), 418*b*, 419*a*; (1, 2), 419*a*; (1, 3), 419*a*, 421*b*; (1, 6), 419*a*, 420*b*; (1, 7), 419*a*; (**2, 1**), 419*a*, 421*b*, 422*a*; (2, 2), 420*b*; (2, 4), 419*b*; (2, 6), 419*b*, 420*b*; (3, 1: 3, 3: 3, 4), 419*b*; (**3, 5**), 422*a*, 423*a*; (3, 7), 419*b*; (**3, 8**), 419*b*, 422*a*; (3, 9), 334*b*, 419*b*; (3, 10), 419*b*, 420*a*, 422*a*; (3, 11), 419*b*; (4, 1), 421*b*; (4, 2), 419*a*, 420*a*; (4, 3), 420*a*; (4, 4), 419*a*; (4, 5: 4, 6), 420*a*; (4, 8), 419*a*, 420*a*; (4, 9), 419*b*, 420*b*; (**4, 13**), 419*b*, 420*a*,

Xenophon, *continued*—
422*b*; **(4, 14)**, 420*a*, 422*b*; (4, 16), 421*a*; **(4, 17 : 4, 18)**, 420*a*, 422*b*; (4, 22), 425*a*; (4, 23), 420*a*; **(4, 26)**, 422*b*, 423*a*; (4, 28), 420*b*; **(4, 32)**, 234*a*, 420*a*, 421*b*; (4, 33), 420*a*; **(4, 35)**, 419*b*, 420*a*, 422*a*, 423*a*; **(4, 37)**, 423*a*; (4, 39), 422*b*; (4, 40), 420*b*, 421*b*; (4, 41), 419*b*; **(4, 43)**, 419*a*, 423 f.; (4, 44 : 4, 46), 420*a*; (4, 47), 419*b*; **(4, 48)**, 424*a*, *b*; (4, 49), 419*a*, 420*b*; (4, 50), 420*a*; **(4, 51)**, 420*a*, 424*b*; **(4, 52)**, 419*b*, 421*a*, 424*b*, 425*b*; **(5, 1)**, 420*a*, *b*, 424*b*; **(5, 2)**, 420*a*, 425*a*; **(5, 3)**, 425*a*; (5, 5), 420*b*; (5, 6), 418*b*, 419*a*; (5, 7), 420*b*; **(5, 8)**, 420*b*, 425*a*; (5, 9 : 5, 10), 420*b*, 421*b*; (5, 11), 419*b*; **(5, 12)**, 419*a*, 420*b*, 425*a*; (6, 1), 419*b*, 420*b*; **(6, 2)**, 236*b*, 421*b*, 425*a*, *b*; (6, 3), 419*b*, 420*b*.

Hellen. i. (4, 17), 420*a*; ii. (3, 13 *sq.*), 229*b*: (3, 25), 336*a*: **(3, 31** : 3, 32), 22*b*; iii. (1, 9), 135*b*: (4, 11), 335*a*; **(4, 15)**, 335*a*, *b*: **(4, 23)**, 337*b*; iv. (1, 30), 335*b*: (3, 3), 336*a*: (3, 6), 335*a*: (3, 17), 335*b*: (3, 20), 335*a*, 337*b*: (4, 9 : 5, 1), 335*a*: (5, 18), 419*a*; v. (1, 24), 332*b*: (1, 33), 419*b*: (2, 43), 135*b*: (4, 31), 419*b*; vi. (1, 15), 135*a*: (5, 6), 336*a*; vii. (5, 23), 333*b*.

Hiero **(1, 1 : 1, 4**: 1, 11), 17*a*; **(1, 14)** 17*a*, *b*; **(1, 15)**, 17*b*; (1, 18), 17*a*, *b*; **(1, 19)**, 17*a*; **(1, 23)**, 17*b*, 18*a*; **(1, 27)**, 17*a*, 18*a*; **(1, 28)**, 18*a*; (1, 29), 17*a*; **(1, 38)**, 18*a*; (2, 2), 17*a*; **(2, 3)**, 18*a*, *b*; **(2, 4)**, 18*b*; (2, 5), 18*a*; **(2, 7 : 2, 12–14)**, 18*b*; **(2, 15)**, 17*b*, 18*b*; **(4, 3 : 4, 11)**, 18*b*; **(6, 2)**, 17*b*, 18*b*; (6, 3 : **6, 10**), 19*a*; (6, 11), 19*b*; **(6, 16)**, 19*a*; (7, 10), 19*b*; **(7, 11)**, 19*a*; (8, 1), 18*a*; **(8, 5 : 8, 9 : 9, 7)**, 19*a*; (9, 11), 419*b*; (10, 3), 333*b*; (11, 4), 336*a*; **(11, 7 : 11, 12)**, 19*b*.

Hipparch. **(1, 3)**, *ib.*; (1, 19), 420*a*; **(3, 3)**, 19*b*; (3, 12 : 4, 3 *sqq.*), 421*b*; **(4, 12 : 5, 8 : 6, 5** : 7, 1 : **7, 4)**, 20*a*; (8, 4), 419*a*; **(8, 5: 8, 12)**, 20*a*; **(9, 1)**, 20*a*, *b*: (9, 3), 19*b*; (9, 8), 20*a*, 421*a*.

Mem. i. (2, 16), 334*b*: (2, 54), 336*a*: (2, 58), 229*b*: **(4, 6)**, 134*b*: (4, 13), 419*a*: (4, 16) 420*a*: (6, 2), 336*a*: (6, 5), 230*a*; iii. (14, 7), 420*a*; iv. (3, 8), 419*b*: (3, 13), 334*a*: (4, 19), 337*a*.

Occ. (1, 11), 419*a*; **(2, 15)**, 21*b*; (4, 3), 420*a*; (7, 21), 140*a*; (7, 31), 333*b*; **(8, 2)**, 22*a*; (9, 7), 333*a*; **(12, 17)**, 22*a*; **(19, 9)**, 22*a*, *b*; (21, 4–5), 333*a*; (21, 8), 333*b*.

Resp. Ath. (*init.*), 232*a*; **(1, 1)**, 230*b*, 235*a*, *b*; (1, 2), 230*a*, 231*b*, 235*a*; **(1, 3)**, 231*a*, *b*,

Xenophon, *continued*—
235*a*; **(1, 4)**, 229*b*; **(1, 5)**, 230*a*, 231*b*, 235*a*; **(1, 6)**, 230*a*, 235*a*; (1, 8 : 1, 9), 230*a*; (1, 10), 233*b*, 234*a*; **(1, 11)**, 21*a*, 138*a*, 230*a*, 233*a*, *b*, 234*a*, 235*a*; (1, 12), 230*a*, 233*a*; (1, 13), 230*a*, *b*, 425*b*; **(1, 14)**, 231*a*, 235*a*; (1, 16), 231*b*; (1, 18), 230*a*, 234*b*; (1, 19), 234*b*; (1, 20), 231*a*; (2, 1 : **2, 2**), 235*a*; **(2, 3)**, 230*a*, 235*a*; (2, 4), 231*b*; (2, 5), 233*b*; (2, 6), 230*a*; **(2, 7 : 2, 8)**, 230*a*, 235*b*; (2, 10), 231*b*; **(2, 11)**, 21*b*, 138*a*, 230*a*, 232*a*, 234*a*, 235*b*; **(2, 12)**, 21*b*, 138*a*, 230*a*, 233*a*, *b*, 234*a*, 235*b*; (2, 13), 230*a*; (2, 14), 231*a*; **(2, 15)**, 235*b*; (2, 17), 230*a*, 231*a*, *b*; (2, 18), 229*b*, 230*b*; (2, 19), 230*a*, 235*a*; **(2, 20)**, 235*b*; **(3, 1)**, 231*b*, 235*b*; **(3, 2)**, 230*a*, 235*b*; (3, 4), 230*a*; **(3, 5)**, 230*a*, 231*b*, 234*a*, 421*b*; **(3, 6)**, 230*a*, 235*b*, 236*a*; (3, 7 : 3, 9), 230*a*; (3, 10), 230*a*, 232*a*, 235*a*; **(3, 12)**, 230*a*, 236*a*; (3, 13), 230*a*.

Resp. Laced. **(1, 1)**, 134*a*, 236*a*; (1, 2), 135*b*; (1, 3), 134*a*, 135*a*; **(1, 4)**, 135*b*, 236*a*; (1, 5), 134*a*, 135*a*, *b*; **(1, 6)**, 236*b*; **(1, 7)**, 135*b*, 136*a*, 236*b*, 237*a*; (1, 8), 135*a*; (1, 9), 134*b*; (2, 1), 134*a*, 135*a*; (2, 2), 134*b*, 135*a*; **(2, 3** *sqq.*), 134*b*, 135*b*, 236*a*, 237*a*; (2, 4), 136*a*, 236*b*; (2, 5), 135*b*; (2, 6), 134*a*, *b*, 135*b*, 333*b*, 419*a*; (2, 7), 134*b*; (2, 9 : 2, 10), 135*a*; **(2, 11)**, 135*b*; **(2, 12 : 2, 14)**, 237*a*; **(3, 1)**, 135*b*, 237*a*; (3, 3), 134*a*, 135*b*; **(3, 4)**, 134*a*, 135*a*, *b*; (3, 5), 237*a*; (4, 1), 236*a*; (4, 5), 134*b*; (4, 6), 135*a*, 237*a*; (4, 7), 135*b*, 236*b*; (5, 1), 236*b*; **(5, 3)**, 134*a*, 136*a*, 237*a*; **(5, 5)**, 135*a*, 237*a*; (5, 7), 134*a*, 135*a*, *b*, 333*b*; (5, 8), 134*a*; **(6, 1)**, 134*a*, 236*b*, 237*a*; (6, 2), 135*a*; (6, 3), 135*a*, 136*a*; **(6, 4)**, 134*b*, 237*b*; (7, 2), 134*b*; (7, 3), 135*a*; (7, 6), 134*b*, 135*a*; (8, 1), 135*a*; (8, 2), 134*b*, 135*a*; **(8, 3)**, 237*b*; **(8, 4)**, 135*b*, 237*b*; (8, 5), 134*a*, 135*a*, 236*b*, 425*a*; (9, 1), 134*b*, 135*a*; (9, 3), 134*a*, 135*a*: (9, 4), 135*b*; (10, 1), 134*a*, 135*a*, *b*, 236*b*, 339*b*; **(10, 2)**, 237*b*; (10, 4), 135*a*; (10, 7), 135*a*, *b*; **(11, 2)**, 135*b*, 237*b*; **(11, 3)**, 135*a*, 136*a*, 237*b*; (11, 4), 135*a*; (11, 6), 134*a*, 135*b*; (11, 7), 134*b*; (11, 8), 134*a*; (11, 9), 134*a*, *b*; (12, 2), 134*b*; (12, 3), 136*a*, 236*b*; **(12, 5)**, 134*b*, 135*a*; (13, 1), 134*a*, *b*; (13, 2), 134*b*; (13, 3), 135*b*; (13, 6), 134*b*; (13, 7), 135*a*, *b*; (13, 8), 237*b*; (13, 11), 135*b*; (14, 4), 134*a*, *b*; (14, 7), 135*b*; (15, 1), *ib.*; (15, 3), 135*a*; (15, 5), 134*a*; (15, 8), 135*a*.

Symp. (2, 6), 140*b*; (2, 9), 141*a*; (3, 7), 58*a*; (4, 48), 333*b*; (7, 4), 419*b*; (8, 3), 333*b*; (8, 35), 334*b*.

III.—GREEK INDEX.

A.

ἀβρύνεσθαι, 335*b*
ἀγάλλεσθαι, 333*a*
ἄγαν, 12*a*, 300*b*
ἀγαστός (-ῶς), 334*b*
ἀγήρατος, 334*a*
ἀγός, 16*a*
ἀδιάσπαστος, 335*b*
ἀδιάφορα (the Stoic), 330*a* (n.)
ἀέναος, 334*b*, 420*a*
ἀϜυτάν, 191*a*, *b*
ἀϜυτάρ, 191*a*
ἀήτης· ἄνεμος (Hesych.), 92*b*
ἀθύτου (Hesych.), 296*a*
αι and η confounded, 32*b*
αἰβετός (Hesych.), 92*b*
αἰετός)(Αἴολος, *ib.*
αἰῆται· ἄνεμοι (Hesych.), *ib.*
αἰπόλος, 143*a*
αἱρεῖσθαι (with acc. and inf.), 230*b*
...ἤ (without μᾶλλον), 336*a*
ἀκαλός, 95*b*
Ἀκαμάντιον (Steph. Byz.), 171*a*
ἄκαρον· τυφλόν (Hesych.), 92*b*
ἀκίνδῡνος (Ausonius), 261*b*
ἀλκή (ἄλκιμος), 333*b*
ἀλκήτωρ, 32*a*
ἀλλοδαπός, 419*b*
ἀλυσκάνειν (?), 30*a*
ἄμαλλα, 91*a* (n.)
ἅμαξα, 13*b* (n.)
ἀμαυρός (ἀμαυροῦν), 334*a*
ἀμεϜυσάσθαι, 191*a*
ἀμείνων, 14*a* (and n.)
ἅμιλλα (ὅμιλος), 91*a*
ἀμύσσω)(ἀφύσσω, 446 f.
ἀμφί (Xen.), 134*b*, 229*a*, 334*a*, 335*b*, 419*a*
ἀμφιθάλαττος, 419*a*
ἀμφίλογος, 419*b*
ἀμφότερα (Steph. *Thes. s.v.*), 395*b*
(=*zusammen* 'total'), 395*a*
ἀμφότεροι (=*beiderlei*), 394*a*
(in later Greek), 393 ff.
ἀναγχίστευτος, 137*b*
ἀναθρώσκειν, 135*b*
ἀνὰ κράτος, 333*a*
ἀνακτᾶσθαι ('win over'), 420*b*
ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν, 333*b*, 334*a*, 420*b*
τὰ πεδία (ὄρη), 334*b*, 335*a*, 420*b*
ἀναφαίνεσθαι, 419*a*
ἀνδραποδωνεῖν, 423*a*
ἀντιβολεῖν, 230*a*
ἀντίον, 398*a*, *b*
ἀντίος, 333*a*
ἀντίπροικα, 336*a*
ἀνυπόστατος, 135*a*
ἀνυστός, 134*a*

ἀνώχυρος, 335*b*
ἀπέλλαι (Hesych.), 144*a*, *b*
ἀπόβασις (Thuc.), 4*b*, 5*a*, 157*b*
ἀποδεικνύναι ('ordain'), 135*a*
ἀποθύειν, 334*b*
ἀποκαθιστάναι ('restore'), 136*a*
ἀπόμοιρα, 49 ff.
ἀποσκίασμα, 360*a*
ἄπυρα (ἱερά), 294 ff.
ἄρα (Xen.), 230*a*
ἆρα δή (Xen.), *ib.*
ἀραιός, 135*b*
ἀρεστός, 334*a*
ἀρήγειν, 134*b*
ἀστυφέλικτος, 135*b*
ἀτάρ, 421*a*
ἄτε, 231*a*
ἀτέλεια (*immunitas*), 251 ff.
ἀτρεμής, 333*b*
ἄττα, 230*a*, 231*a*
αὔξειν (αὐξάνειν), 420*a*
αὐτόθι, ἐκεῖ, ἐνταῦθα (Xen.), 230*a*, 231*b*, 233*a*
αὐτόθι, ἐνθάδε (Xen.), 421*b*
αὐτοφυής, 419*a*
ἀφνειός, 397*b*
ἄφοδος, 135*a*
ἀφύσσω)(ἀμύσσω, 446 f.
ἄχθομαι (with acc.), 230*b*

B.

βαλικιώτης (Hesych.), 92*b*
Βίππος, 143*a*
βλακεύειν, 135*a*
Βουφράς, 6*a*
βρ, vowel-quantity before, 341*b*, 342*a*
βροτός)(ἀνήρ, 15*b* (n.)

Γ.

γε, γοῦν (Xen.), 230*a*
γε μήν (Xen.), 62*b*, 134*b*, 334*a*
γενναῖοι (χρηστοί), οἱ, 229*b*
γεννικός, 335*b*.
γεραιός, 135*b*
γηραιός, 335*b*
γλωττόκομον, 436*a*
γνώμην ἐμήν, 375*b* (n.)
γοργός, 135*a*
γρ, vowel-quantity before, 342*a*
γυμνασιαρχεῖσθαι (pass.), 424*b*, 425*b*

Δ.

δέ (*in apodosi*), 420*b*
δεξιός, 230*a*
δεται (δέω), 298*a* (n.)

δή (Xen.), 230*a*
δῆμος (*οἱ πένητες*), 229*b*
δημόται (=*δήμοτικοί*), *ib.*
διαγίγνεσθαι (with adj.), 336*a*
(with part.), 334*a*
διαθρύπτειν, 135*a*
διαίτημα, 230*a*
διάκορος (διακορής), 135*b*
διαπονεῖν (-εἶσθαι), 331*a*
διαπράττειν, 135*a*
διατελεῖν (with adj.), 336*a*
διατρέφειν (-τροφή), 419*a*
Δίδας (Δειδᾶς), 261*a*, *b*
δίδωμι (with obj. inf.), 420*b*
διήφυσε (Hom.), 445 ff.
δρ, vowel-quantity before, 342*a*
δυνάμενος (*οἱ δυνάμενοι*), 229*b*
δυσάρεστος, 334*a*
δύσελπις, 419*b*
δυσεύρετος, 420*a*
δωρεῖσθαι, 333*b*
δωροδοκεῖν (Hesych.), 100*b*
δωροδοκία (Hesych.), *ib.*

E.

ἐγγύς (with numerals), 420*a*
ἐγγύτατα (πλησιαίτατα) πόλις (ἡ), *ib.*
ἐγχειρεῖν, 334*b*, 420*b*
ἐγώ (a use of), 138 ff.
(of imaginary speaker), 230*a*, 233*b*, 234*a*
ἔδνα, 292*b*
ἐείκοσι, 143*b*
ἐθέλειν (=*βούλεσθαι*), 334*b*
ἐθελούσιος, 135*a*, 335*a*
εἰρμός, 436*a*
εἰς τὰ ἔσχατα μάλα σοφός, 135*b*
ἔϊσος, 143*b* (and n.)
ἔκγονα, 135*b*
ἐκδιώκειν τὰ αἰσχρά, 335*b*
ἐκ δημοσίου (*οἱ*), 135*b*
ἐκκλησία, 144*a*
τοῦ θεοῦ (*κυρίου*), 317*b*
ἔκπλεως, 420*b*
ἐκπονεῖν, 334*a*
ἐκτελεῖν, 135*b*
ἔκτωρ (ἔχω), 32*a*
ἑκυρός (*socer*), 146*b*
ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν, 377*b*
ἐμπόρευμα, 419*b*
ἔμπροσθεν (πρόσθεν), 134*b*, 334*b*, 420*b*
ἔμπυρα (ἱερά), 294*b*, 295*a*
ἐμφυσιῶσαι, 135*b*
ἐνδεῖσθαι, 420*a*
ἔνθα (Xen.), 134*a*, 229*a*, 332*b*, 335*b*
ἐνθάδε, αὐτόθι (Xen.), 421*b*
ἔνι, 231*b*
ἐνιαυτός, 221*b*
ἔνιοι (ἐνίοτε), 231*b*
ἐν ὠφελείᾳ ('yielding a profit'), 420*a*
ἐξαμείβειν, 335*b*
ἐξαπιναῖος (ἐξαπίνης), 231*b*
ἐξομιλεῖν, 335*b*
ἑός (=*σός*), 167*a*
ἔπαιξα)(ἔπαισα, 447*a*
ἐπάλληλος, 436*a*
ἐπαρκεῖν, 236*a*
ἐπεί (Xen.), 134*a*, 334*b*, 419*a*
ἐπείπερ, 419*a*
ἐπὶ πόλεως (*οἱ*), 135*b*
φρουρᾶς, *ib.*
ἐπίκλησις, *ib.*
ἐπικουρεῖν, 134*b*, 419*a*
ἐπιμίσγεσθαι, 230*a*, 231*b*
ἐπισπεύδειν, 419*b*
ἐπιτυχών (ὁ), 335*b*
ἐπιχειρεῖσθαι (pass.), 420*a*
ἐπίψογος, 135*b*
ἔπεσθαι, 134*b*
ἐρᾶν, 334*a*
ἐρευνᾶν, 134*b*
ἐρίζειν, 334*b*
ἔρυμα, 420*a*
ἔρχομαι λέξων, 336*a*
ἔσκε (ἦε), 31*b*
ἔστε (Xen.), 134*a*, 229*a*, 335*b*
ἔστιν ὅτε (*οἵ*), 419*b*
εὐαγία, 32*a*
εὔδηλος, 420*a*
εὐδράνεια· *ἰσχύς* (Hesych.), 32*b*
εὐθενεῖν, 230*a*
εὐκλεής, 420*b*
εὐπάθεια, 335*b*
εὐπαράπειστος, *ib.*
εὐπειθής, 420*a*
εὐπετής (-ῶς), 335*a*
εὐπόλεμος, 420*a*
εὔρωστος, *ib.*
εὐφροσύνη, 135*a*, 332*b*
εὐχερέστερον, 135*b*
ἐφίεσθαι (with acc.), 339*a*, *b*
ἐχθραίνειν, 335*b*

H.

η and αι confounded, 32*b*
ἦ (Xen.), 134*a*
ἡδυπάθεια, 135*a*
ἦε (ἔσκε), 31*b*
Ἡλιάδες κοῦραι, 409*b*
ἦλιξ, 135*a*
ἦπαρ (*iecur*), 14*b*
ἠρεμεῖν, 333*b*
ἥρπαξα)(ἥρπασα, 447*a*

Θ.

θέμις γ' εἶναι, 377*b*
θιγεῖν ἐν ('grasp'), 60*b*
θλ, vowel-quantity before, 342*a*
θμ, vowel-quantity before, 342*b*
θν, vowel-quantity before, 341*a*, 342*b*
θοίνη (and derivatives), 333*a*
θολός, 260*b*
θρ, vowel-quantity before, 342*a*
θρεπτοί, 138*a*
θυμὸν ἀπολλύναι, 196*b*
θυμῷ ('with spirit'), 333*a*

I.

ἱδροσύνη, 137*a*
ἱερός (etymology of), 277*b*
ἱκανός (=*κύριος*), 135*b*
ἰλαδόν)(ὁμιλαδόν, 91*a* (and n.), 93*a*
ἵνα, ὅπως (Xen.), 419*b*
ἱππίξενος, 143*a*
Ἵππος, *ib.*
ἰσηγορία, 230*a*
ἴσος, 143*a*, 144*a*
ἰσοτέλεστος, 195*a*
ἰσχυρῶς (=*πάνυ, σφόδρα*), 135*a*, 420*a*

K.

καί (a use of), 140 f.
καὶ...γε (Xen.), 420*b*
καὶ...δέ (Xen.), 134*b*, 230*a*, 333*b*, 420*b*
καὶ δή (Xen.), 230*a*
καὶ μέντοι (Xen.), 335*a*
καὶ μήν (Xen.), 135*b*

κακοδαιμονία, 135*a*
κακόδοξος (and derivatives), 335*b*
κακονομία, 230*a*
καλαμαύλης, 226*a*
καλοὶ κἀγαθοί (οἱ), 229*b*
καλοκἀγαθία, 135*a*, 334*a*
καταδαπανᾶν, 420*b*
κατάδηλος, 334*b*
κατακαίνειν, 335*a*
καταπράττειν, 420*b*
κατάρχειν, 134*b*
κατασκελετεύειν, 436*b*
κατεργάζεσθαι, 135*a*
κατεστάθη, 135*b*
κέντρον (and derivatives), 137*a*
κερδαλέος, 419*b*
κλ, vowel-quantity before, 342*b*
κλωπεύειν, 134*b*
κμ, vowel-quantity before, 342*b*
κν, vowel-quantity before, *ib.*
κνέφας (κνεφαῖος), 135*b*
κοιμᾶσθαι, 333*b*
κολεός, 335*b*
κρ, vowel-quantity before, 342*b*
κρατεῖσθαι (with inf.), 336*a*
κρατύνειν, 134*b*
κρυψίνους, 335*b*
κτᾶσθαι τείχη, 338*a*
κτήνη, 335*a*

Λ.

λάγνος (*leno*, *lena*), 14*a*, 298*a*
λατρεύειν, 335*b*
λάφυρα πωλεῖν (λαφυροπωλεῖν), 332*b*, 334*b*
λήγειν, 419*a*
λήθειν, 333*a*, *b*
ληίς (=λεία), 135*b*
λογίζεσθαι ζημίαν, 420*a*
λῦγρός, 31*a*
λωβᾶσθαι, 230*a*

M.

μαγειρεῖον, 436*a*
μαδᾶ· ἐκρεῖ (Hesych.), 90*b*
μαθημοσύνη, 137*a*
μάκαρες (*manes*), 14*a*
μαλακός (μαλθακός), 93*a*
μάλεοι· ὄριοι (Hesych.), *ib.*
μαμμόθρεπται, 57*b*
μάσσων (μήκιστος), 134*b*, 333*b*, 334*a*
μαστεύειν, 333*b*, 335*b*
ματίς, ματήρ, ματία, ματίσαι (Hesych.), 14*a* (n.)
μεγάλαυχος, 335*b*
μεγαλεῖος (-ως), 135*a*, 334*a*
μεγαληγορεῖν, 333*b*
μεγαλογνώμων (-οσύνη), *ib.*
μεγαλύνεσθαι, 135*a*
μεγάλως, *ib.*
μεῖζον (*maius*), 14*b*
μειρακιοῦσθαι, 135*b*
μεῖραξ, *ib.*
μείων (and derivatives), 134*b*, 332*b*, 334*b*, 335*a*, 420*a*
μελίσπονδα, 295*a*, 297*b*
μέλλαξ (Hesych. μέλακες), 93*a*
μὲν...δέ (Xen.), 230*a*, 420*b*
μετά: see σύν)(μετά
μετὰ χεῖρας, 335*a*
μηδὲ τοῦτο φοβεῖσθε, ὡς κ.τ.λ., 420*a*
μήν (Xen.), 229*a*, 230*a*, 420*b*
μηχανᾶσθαι (with acc. and inf.), 336*a*
μῆχαρ (μῆχος), 14*b*
μιαίνειν, 91*b*
μίνθος, *ib.*
μίσγειν, *ib.*
μισθὸν λύειν (τίνειν), 336*a*
μισθός, 91*a*
μνήμων, 335*b*
μόγος (μογερός), 14*b* (n.)
μόχθος (μοχθεῖν), 333*a*
μυομαχία, 165*b*

N.

ναFυπηγός, 191*a*
νηφάλια (τά), 294*b*, 295*a*, 296*a*, 297*b*
νομίζειν, 136*a*, 236*b*

Ξ.

ξυμφορά, 192*b*, 193*a*

O.

ο (close), 191*a*, *b*
ὀ- (copulative), 90*a*
ὄαρ, (*soror*), 146*b*, 147*a*
Ὀβριαρεύς (Βριαρεύς), 89*b*
ὀβριμοπάτρη, *ib.*
ὄβριμος (ὄμβριμος), 89*a*, *b*
ὄζυγες (ὁμόζυγες), 90*a*
οἷ, 231*a*
οἶκοι (*vici*), 142*b*
-οιο, -οο (-ου), genitives in, 255 ff.
ὀλίγιστος, 230*a*, 231*b*
ὄμαδος (ὁμάδησαν), 90*a*, *b*
ὁμαρές (Hesych.), 90*a*
ὁμῆλιξ, 92*b*, 93*a*
ὄμηρος (ὅμορος), 90*a*
ὁμογνώμων, 135*a*
ὁμονόως, 335*a*
ὄνειαρ (ὄνεαρ), 31*b*
ὄπατρος (ὁμοπάτριος), 90*a*
ὅπως, ἵνα (Xen.), 419*b*
ὁρμή, 305*a*, *b*
ὀρυμαγδός, 90*b*
ὄρφνη (ὄρφνινος), 135*b*
ὅσα (ὅσαπερ), 135*a*, 333*b*
ὅσ' ἔτη, 230*a*
ὅσον ἐμέ γ' εἰδέναι, 377*b*
ὄτριχες, 90*a*
οὔθαρ, 14*b*
οὐ (*haud*), origin of, 461*b*
ὄφατα, ὀφνίς, ὄχος, 13*b* (n.)
ὀχετός (*vena*), 13*b*
ὀψιαίτατα, 419*a*

Π.

παλαιόν (τό), 420*b*
πάμπαν, 135*a*, 332*b*, 334*a*
πανθηής, 32*a*
πάνυ (Xen.), 230*a*
παρά (Xen.), 134*b*
παράλογος (-ως), 136*a*
παράπαν (τό), 336*a*
παρεγγύησις, 135*a*
παρέκτωρ (παρέχω), 32*a*
παρέχειν, 335*a*
Παρθένιος (Steph. Byz. *s.v.*), 95*b*
παροιχόμενα (τά), 420*a*
ΠασιάδᾱFο, 190 f., 307*a*, *b*
πασσυδίᾳ (πασσυδί), 335*a*
παύειν ἀπό τινος, 135*b*
πεπαμένος, 134*b*
περᾶν, 135*b*
περίρρυτος, 419*a*
περιτιθέναι (τὴν δύναμιν), 230*a*
πῇ (ππ), 333*a*, 335*a*, 419*a*
πίει, δέχοι, δίδοι, &c. (in vase inscrr.), 130*b*
πλ, vowel-quantity before, 343*a*
πλάξ ('stone', 'tablet'), 32*b*
πλαστύς, 335*b*
πληγὰς ἐμβάλλειν, 135*a*

πλῆκται, 107*a*
πλημμύρειν (Steph. *Thes. s.v.*), 452*a*
πλουτίζειν, 420*a*
πν, vowel-quantity before, 343*a*
πόλεως ἄνδρες, 195*b*
πολύ (with compar.), 419*b*
πολυεπαίνετος, 335*b*
πολυέραστος, *ib.*
πολυπείρητος, 137*a*
πολυχρόνιος, 420*a*
πονηροί (οἱ), πονηρία, 229*b*
πρ, vowel-quantity before, 342*b*
πράττειν, 336*a*
πρίν (πάρος) with inf., 377*b*
προκόσμημα, 436*a*
προξενίας ψήφισμα, 174*b*
πρόσθεν (ἔμπροσθεν), 134*b*, 334*b*, 420*b*
προστατεύειν (προστατεῖν), 418*b*, 419*a*
προστάτης (τῆς πόλεως &c.), 418*b*
προσυπογράφειν, 436*a*
προσφιλής, 420*b*
προτέλεια, 296*a*
προτελεῖν 334*b*, 419*b*
προτρυγητήρ, 310*a*
πρωΐτατα, 419*a*
πυκνά, 135*a*

P.

ῥαδινός, 135*b*
ῥᾳδιουργεῖν (ῥᾳδιουργία), 134*b*, 334*a*
ῥυπαίνειν, 136*a*
ῥώμη, 333*b*, 334*b*

Σ.

σηκός, 144*a*
σίνεσθαι, 134*b*
σκότος (gender of), 216*a*
σμογερόν (Hesych.), 14*b* (n.)
στερίσκειν, 334*a*
στεφάνωσις (Suidas *s.v.*), 16*b*
στόμα τοῦ βίου (τό), 336*a*, 339*b*
στόλος, 335*a*
σύ (to imaginary reader), 230*a*, 233*b*, 234*a*
σύν)(μετά, 134*a*, *b*, 229*a*, 333*a*, 334*a*, 335*a*, 419*b*
συναινεῖν, 420*b*
συνώρια, 32*a*
συσκήνια, 135*b*
σφάλματα ἐγένοντο, 335*a*
σφίσι, 231*a*
σφός (=ἐμός), 137*a*
σφῶν αὐτῶν (=ἀλλήλων), 135*a*
(for ἑαυτῶν), 231*a*
σχολαι(ό)τατα, 135*a*
σώης, 32*a*, *b*

T.

τανίσφυρος (Steph. *Thes. s.v.*), 451*b*
Τάτα, Ταταῖς &c., 138*a*
τάχος (ταχυτής), 333*a*
τε (connective), 420*b*
τε...καὶ μήν (Xen.), 135*b*
τε...τε (Xen.), 134*b*, 334*b*, 420*b*, 421*a*
τέκνον (and derivatives), 135*a*, 332*b*
τέρμα, 135*b*
τέρπειν (τερπνός), 333*b*
(=τέρπεσθαι), 137*a*
τεχνᾶσθαι, 333*b*
τηθαλλαδοῦς, 58*a*
τί μήν; (Plat.), 62*b*, 63*b*
τλ, vowel-quantity before, 343*a*
Τλᾱσῐ̄ᾱ̄Fo, 190 f.
τμ, vowel-quantity before, 343*a*
τν, vowel-quantity before, *ib.*
τὸ δὲ μέγιστον, 375*b* (n.)
τοι (Xen.), 230*a*
τοιγαροῦν (Xen.), 333*b*
τὸ μὲν τῇ, τὸ δὲ τῇ, 230*a*
τορός, 135*b*
τὸ σὸν μέρος, 375*b* (n.)
τόσος, 420*a*
τοῦτο μὲν ἐκ τῆς, τοῦτο δ' ἐκ τῆς, 230*a*
τρ, vowel-quantity before, 343*a*
τραπεζίτης, 172*a*
τριάκοντα, 93*b*
τριηραρχεῖσθαι (pass.), 230*b*
τύχη, τυγχάνω (proper names from), 137*a*
τῶν δεομένων γίγνεσθαι, 135*b*
τῷ παντί, 135*a*, 335*a*

Υ.

ὑγρός (*umor*), 13*a*
and ὕβρις, 89*b*
ὕδωρ, 14*b*
ὑπεκκαυστρία, 297*b*
ὑπέραυχος, 335*b*
ὑπερφέρειν, 135*a*
ὑφηγεῖσθαι (χρήματα, ἀγαθά), 334*b*
ὑφίστασθαι, 336*a*, 338*b*

Φ.

φαγεῖν, 13*b*, 298*a*
φέρε δή (Xen.), 230*a*
φιλόστροργος, 333*b*
φλ, vowel-quantity before, 343*b*
φν, vowel-quantity before, *ib.*
φορέσκειν, 32*b*
φρ, vowel-quantity before, 343*b*
φρονηματίας, 335*b*
φρόνιμος)(συνετός, 193*a*

X.

χαμαί, 335*b*
χλ, vowel-quantity before, 343*b*
χμ, vowel-quantity before, *ib.*
χν, vowel-quantity before, *ib.*
χορηγεῖσθαι (pass.), 230*b*
χρ, vowel-quantity before, 343*b*
Χριστιανοί, 317*a*, *b*
Χριστός (Χρηστός), *ib.*
χρυσὸς λευκός)(ἄπεφθος, 173*a*
χῶροι (=ἀγροί), 420*a*

Ω.

ὦ ἐμὲ δείλαιον, 375*b*, 376*a*
ὠμόλινα, 16*a*
ὠρέχθην, 334*b*
ὡς (=ὥστε), 332*b*, 334*a*, 335*a*, 419*b*
(final), 134*a*, 229*a*, 334*a*, *b*, 419*b*
(in 'object clauses'), 333*b*, 334*b*
ὡς ἀληθῶς, 230*a*
ὡς ἄν (with opt.), 420*a*
ὡσαύτως, 135*a*, 420*a*
ὡς ἐπεικάζειν ἐμέ, 377*b*
ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, *ib.*
ὦ τάλας ἐγώ, 376*a*
ὠφέλημα, 333*b*

BINDING SLIP. APR 15 1960

PA
1
C7
v.11

The Classical review

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY